THE

JUDGMENT

OF THE

FATHERS

Concerning the

Doctrine of the TRINITY;

Opposed to

Dr. *G. Bull's* DEFENCE of the *Nicene* Faith.

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. NEW YORK.

PART I.

— Smallbroke. DNB 41: 282f

The Doctrine of the Catholick Church, during the first 150 Years of Christianity; and the Explication of the Unity of God (in a Trinity of Divine Persons) by some of the following Fathers, considered.

London, Printed in the Year MDCXCV.

XUM

The JUDGMENT *of the* Fathers *concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

I. *The Design of Dr.* Bull's *Book.*

I Intend, in these Sheets, to examine Dr. *Bull*'s *Defence of the Nicene Faith:* I shall prescribe to my self, to be as brief as possible I can, and to deal fairly and ingenuously.

What is the Pretence of his Book, he tells us at *pag. 5th* and *6th* of his Preface to it, in these Words; "To "evince, that all the *approved Do-* "*ctors* and Fathers of the Church, "from the very Age of the Apostles "to the first Nicene Council, agreed, "in one common and self-same "Faith, concerning the Divinity of "our Saviour, with the said Nicene "Council. *A ridiculous Offer*; for taking care, as he does, to limit himself to the *approved Doctors* and Fathers; who is so dull (does Mr. *Bull* think?) as not to understand, that no Father or Doctor shall be allowed this (new and rare) Title of *Doctor probatus, approved Doctor*, if Mr. *Bull* and he cannot accord about the Nicene Faith? What if an Arian or Socinian should make the like (impertinent) Proposal, even to show that all *the approved* Doctors and Fathers before the Nicene Council, did agree with *Arius* or *Socinus*; would it not be laugh'd at? For would not the Reader reply immediately, that this (insidious) word *approved* makes his Attempt to be of no use at all: because he will be sure *not to approve* any Doctor or Father, who is not of the Party of *Socinus* or *Arius*. Therefore if Dr. *Bull* would have spoke to the purpose, he should have said simply; that *all* the Ante-nicene Fathers or Doctors were of the same Mind with the Doctors and Fathers in the Nicene Council, in the Question of our Saviour's Divinity: this had come up to the famous κριτήριον, or Rule of Orthodoxy and Truth, suggested first by *Vincentius*, and approved by all Parties; *quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, id demum Catholicum est*; *i. e.* that which *all* the Antient Doctors have taught, and in *all* Places, is Catholick and Fundamental. But Mr. *Bull* durst not pretend to *all* the

Doctors and Fathers before the Nicene Council; but only to certain *approved* Fathers and Writers among them, about 20 among upwards of 200. The Reason is evident; he foreſaw, that we ſhould preſently mind him of *Theodotion*, *Symmachus*, *Paulus* Patriarch of *Antioch*, *Theodorus* of *Byzantium*, *Apollonides*, *Hermophilus*, *Lucianus*; the Authors of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions and of the Recognitions; of *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who publiſhed a Book with this Title, περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως Χριστοῦ, *of the Creation and Birth of Chriſt*: not to mention here the Nazarens or Ebionites, who inhabited *Judea*, *Galilee*, *Moab*, the moſt part of *Syria*, and a great part of *Arabia*; or the *Mineans*, who had their Synagogues or Churches (ſays St. *Jerom*, *Epiſt. ad Auguſt.*) over all *Aſia*; or the 15 firſt Biſhops of *Jeruſalem*.

As theſe were more in number, ſo they were vaſtly ſuperiour in Learning, to Mr. *Bull*'s *approved Doctors* and Fathers. For it was *Theodotion* and *Symmachus*, who (diſtinctly) tranſlated the Bible into Greek; ſo dextrouſly, that their Tranſlations, together with the Tranſlations of the LXX and of *Aquila*, made the τετραπλᾶ (or fourfold Tranſlation) of *Origen*; which was the moſt uſeful, as well as moſt celebrated (Theological) Work, of all Antiquity. It was *Lucianus*, who reſtored the Bible of the LXX to its Purity. Of *Theodorus* or *Theodotus*, St. *Epiphanius* (tho a great Oppoſer of the Unitarians) confeſſes, that he was πολυμαθής, *very Learned*. *Paulus* Patriarch and Archbiſhop of *Antioch*, was ſo elegant a Preacher, that they always hummed, and clapped him: and tho *two* Councils of the adverſe Party, aſſembled at *Antioch* to deprive him, for the Truths he maintained; the Antiochians deſpiſed theſe (*ſeditious*) Councils, who had (*riotouſly*) combined againſt their *Primate*, and would by no means part with *Paulus*. Of the whole Unitarian Party in general, it is noted in *Euſebius*, that they were Learned in Logick, Natural Philoſophy, Geometry, Phyſick, and the other liberal Sciences; and 'tis there (ridiculouſly) imputed to them as a Fault, that they excelled in ſecular Learning; and (much more ridiculouſly) that they were great Criticks, and extremely curious in procuring correct Copies of the Bible. *Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28.* They were perfectly qualified, to judg of good Copies, and to correct faulty ones, by their accurate Knowledg of the Hebrew Tongue: for St. *Epiphanius* (tho ſo much their back-Friend) aſſures us, that they were *Hebraica Lingua ſcientiſſimi*, *great Maſters in the Hebrew Tongue*. Epiph. Hæreſ. Naz. c. 7.

Furthermore, Dr. *Bull* appeals here to *the approved* Doctors and Fathers: but it appears, that he would have it thought, that beſides the 20 Fathers (or thereabouts) whom he has cited; thoſe Fathers alſo whoſe Works are (ſo unhappily) loſt, were no leſs Orthodox (as 'tis called) in this Queſtion.

on about our Saviour's Divinity. But the Criticks, who have written ſincerely and impartially concerning the Fathers, are of opinion, that whereas there are now loſt about 200, for (ſome) 20 Ante-nicene Writers and Fathers who have been preſerved; we are to impute this Loſs, to the Errors contained in their Books; more plainly, to their too manifeſt Agreement with the Arian and Minean (now called the Socinian) Hereſies. The famous Critick *H. Valeſius*, (whom Dr. *Bull* ſometimes commends, nay extols) in his firſt Note on *Euſeb. l. 5. c. 11.* ſpeaking of the Hypotypoſes of St. *Clemens*; concerning which, *Photius* had obſerved, that they are full of Arian Blaſphemies, as that *the Son is but a Creature*, and ſuch like: I ſay, that by occaſion of the ſaid Hypotypoſes *Valeſius* maketh this Note; *Iſti libri ob errores (quibus ſcatebant) negligentius habiti, tandem perierunt; nec alia (meo judicio) cauſa eſt, cur Papiæ & Hegeſippi (aliorumq; veterum) libri interciderint.* 'Tis undeniable, that the Errors intended by *Valeſius*, are the Seeds of Arianiſm and Unitarianiſm, which ſo much abounded in the Hypotypoſes of St. *Clemens*; and he ſaith thereupon, that becauſe of theſe Errors, not only the Hypotypoſes of *Clemens*, but the Works of *Hegeſippus*, *Papias*, and other Primitive (Ante-nicene) Fathers, were firſt ſlighted, and then loſt. Which is in effect to ſay, that the viſible Agreement of the antient Fathers and Doctors with the Unitarians, hath been the Cauſe, that their Writings have miſcarried, are either loſt or elſe deſtroyed; ſo that of above 200 Ante-nicene Writers, ſcarce 20 are left to us, and thoſe alſo very imperfect. Therefore, if it were indeed ſo, that Mr. *Bull*'s *approved Doctors* did really agree in their Faith about the Lord Chriſt, with the Doctors or Fathers in the Nicene Council; as he undertakes to prove, and thinks he has proved: yet his Performance amounts to no more but this; that of the Writers or Fathers who preceded the Nicene Council, about 20 were for the Divinity of our Saviour, and more than 200 againſt it.

II. *The Characters of the Fathers, and their Works; more particularly of St.* Barnabas, Hermas, *and* Ignatius.

WHEN a Man appeals to the Judgment and Authority of any ſort of Writers; the firſt thing to be conſidered, is, what is the Character of thoſe Writers, and their Writings: Were the Writers skilful in that ſort of Learning, of which they are called to be Judges? Are the Works or Writings that are imputed to them, certainly genuine, really and

and undoubtedly theirs? If ſo; yet have they not been corrupted, by (notorious) Additions, or Detractions; ſo that 'tis queſtioned, by indifferent and impartial Perſons, what was written by the Author; and what by the Interpolator? Farther, whereas Dr. *Bull*'s Book is concerning the Faith of the Nicene Fathers, that it agreed perfectly with the Faith of the Fathers who flouriſhed and wrote before that Council; it will be another neceſſary Queſtion, what was the Faith of the Nicene Fathers, either concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, or concerning the (pretended) Trinity? Laſtly, Dr. *Bull* has indeed given us his Opinion concerning the Faith of the Ante-nicene Fathers; but what ſay other (famous) Criticks; who, tho they were zealous Trinitarians, yet being more ſincere and impartial, it may be, they grant that the Doctrine of the Ante-nicene Writers of the Church, was no leſs than *diametrically contrary* to the Nicene Faith, as well as to *the Reform* that has been made of that Faith, by the Divines of the Schools. I ſhall reſolve all theſe Queſtions, in proper Places; at preſent, to the firſt Queſtion.

What is the true Character of theſe Writers, to whom Dr. *Bull* has appealed? He anſwers, concerning one, that he is *doctiſſimus, moſt learned*; of another, that he is *peritiſſimus, moſt able:* and not to tranſcribe all his Flowers, on theſe Fathers, he dubs them all, *Doctores probati, approved Doctors*; which is the leaſt he ever ſays of them. It is in ſome degree excuſable, becauſe it may be imputed to his Zeal, or his Art; that he vends *all his Geeſe for Swans:* but ſure the very ſilleſt Idolaters of his (weak) Book, will hardly approve of it; that he divides even all the Divine Attributes too, among theſe his (ſuppoſed) Friends. For one he calls *ſanctiſſimus, moſt holy*; another is *beatiſſimus, moſt bleſſed*; a third is *optimus, moſt gracious*; and a fourth, *maximus, the moſt high.* There is hardly a Page of his Book, but you meet with one or more of theſe Extravagancies: I ſuppoſe, he tarried longer at School than is ordinary; and ſo being an old Declamer, he could never ſince ſpeak but only in *the ſuperlative Degree*, no not when it borders on Blaſphemy it ſelf. But tho it is true, that few (I believe, none but Dr. *Bull*) have ſpoke or thought of the (remaining) Ante-nicene Fathers, at this wild rate: yet the Opinion that Men generally have of theſe Authors, is, that they were certain moſt grave, learned, ſage, and experienced Divines; and called Fathers, not more for their Antiquity, than for their profound Judgment, and perfect Knowledg, in all the Parts of the Chriſtian Religion. Becauſe the Heads and Patrons of Sects, affect to quote the Fathers; and, if poſſible, to fill their Margin with References to Places in the Fathers: it is therefore almoſt univerſally ſuppoſed, that ſo great Deference has not been paid to them, without moſt juſt Cauſe for it.

'Tis

'Tis in the Fathers, that the Papiſt finds the whole Doctrine of the Council of *Trent:* in the Fathers, the Lutheran finds alſo his Articles; the Calviniſt and the Church of *England*, theirs. The very Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts, and Antinomians, are now turned Father-mongers; and in the Fathers find their Diſcipline and Doctrine, no leſs than their Oppoſers find alſo theirs. In ſhort, there is ſuch a ſcuffling for the Fathers, by all Parties, that 'tis no wonder, if Perſons who have not themſelves read 'em, have a very raiſed and noble Idea of theſe Writers. But all the Glory of the Fathers (I ſpeak of the Ante-nicene Fathers, and except alſo *Origen* out of the Number) is wholly due to the Vanity of modern learned Men; who quote theſe Books, not becauſe indeed they value them; but becauſe being antient Monuments, known to few, and underſtood by fewer; he ſeems a great learned Man, who can drop Sentences out of theſe antique Books. But let us begin, to ſee what indeed they were.

The firſt of the Fathers and their Writings, alledged by Dr. *Bull*, is an Epiſtle (if it pleaſe Heaven) of St. *Barnabas*, the Apoſtle. I confeſs, that St. *Barnabas*, the Evangeliſt and Coadjutor of St. *Paul*, is alſo honoured with the Title of an Apoſtle; *Acts* 14. 4. but that he left behind him an Epiſtle, I ſhall deſire a better Proof than I have yet ſeen. What Dr. *Bull* ſays of him, is, "Our "*moſt learned Hammond*, and *the* "*moſt high Voſſius* believe, this Epiſtle was written by St. *Barnabas*; "chiefly for this Reaſon; becauſe it "is cited under the Name of *Barnabas*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, "*Origen*, and other Antients. Nor "can thoſe of the adverſe Party, alledg any thing to the contrary, "but only this; that the Author of "this Epiſtle expounds too myſtically ſome Paſſages of the Old Teſtament.

No; no other Reaſon to be alledged, why this Epiſtle was not written by the Evangeliſt *Barnabas?* Does he not know, that divers Criticks have obſerved, that if the Antients had really believed that St. *Barnabas*, the Companion, Fellow-Evangeliſt, and Fellow-Apoſtle of St. *Paul*, had wrote this Epiſtle; they would (undoubtedly) have reckoned it among the Canonical Books of Scripture, as St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles are. And has not *Euſebius* informed us, why this Epiſtle was not counted Canonical; when he ſays: "Some "Books are received as Holy Scripture, *by the common Conſent of all*; "namely, the four Goſpels, the "*Acts*, the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, "the firſt Epiſtle of St. *John*, the "firſt of St. *Peter*, and (if you "will) the Revelation of St. *John*: "ſome other Books are *of queſtioned* "*and doubtful Authority*, as the E-"piſtles of *James* and *Jude*, the ſe-"cond of St. *Peter*, the ſecond and "third of St. *John*: but *theſe fol-"lowing are counterfeit pieces*, ἐν "τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω; the "Acts

" Acts of *Paul*, the Revelation of " Peter, *the pretended Epistle of* Bar- " nabas, *&c.* these are Counterfeits. Dr. *Bull* may consider at his leisure, of what Weight the Judgment of (his *most learned*) *Hammond* and (*the most high*) *Vossius* may be, when put into the Scale against *Eusebius* speaking (not his own, but) the Sense of the Primitive Church. And when his Hand is in, let him tell us, what might be in the Mind of *the pretended Barnabas*, as *Eusebius* calls him, to scandalize all the Apostles, by saying; that before they were called to be Apostles, they were (ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν ἀνομωτέρους) *the most flagitious Men in the World.* I am of opinion, we ought to answer, that 'tis not to be wondred at, if *a counterfeit Apostle belies the true ones.* This Crimination of the true Apostles is in the *5th* Chapter of the alledged Epistle.

The more learned and impartial Criticks freely observe, concerning this Epistle, that 'tis full of *strained and dull* Allegories, *extravagant and incongruous* Explications of Scripture, and abundance of *silly and notorious Fables concerning Animals.* And what all judicious Men think of the Epistle, is, that it is indeed very antient, being quoted by *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Origen:* but that it was forged about the beginning of the 2*d* Century, or the 2*d* Century being well advanced; when also the Gospels of St. *Thomas*, St. *Peter*, St. *Matthias*, the Acts of St. *Andrew*, St. *John*, and other Apostles, were devised and published, as *Eusebius* witnesses, *H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 25. But lest this Epistle should be thought to be of somewhat the more Credit, because 'tis (barely) quoted by *Clemens* and *Origen*; the Reader may take notice, that *Clemens* cites also other counterfeit Works of the Apostles, as particularly the Revelation of St. *Peter*, as has been noted by *Eusebius*, *H. E. l.* 6. *c.* 14. And nothing is more common with *Origen*, than to quote such suppositious Writings; as (for Instance) the Book of *Enoch*, the Revelation of St. *Paul*, the Doctrine of St. *Peter*, and many more; concerning which Citations the Reader may see what Mr. *du Pin* has observed at large, *Cent.* 3. *p.* 113.

Dr. *Bull*'s next *approved Father* is the great, either Prophet or Impostor, *Hermas*; in his Book called the *Pastor* or Shepherd.

We grant, that St. *Paul* mentions one *Hermas*, Rom. 16. 14. and we doubt not, that the Author of *the Shepherd* would be understood to be that *Hermas*, for he makes himself contemporary with *Clemens Romanus* (mentioned also by St. *Paul*, Phil. 4. 3.) Vision 2*d*. *Chap.* 4. The Shepherd of *Hermas* is distinguished into 3 Books; whereof the first contains 4 Visions, the second 12 Commands, the third 10 Similitudes: but both the Commands and Similitudes may be called Visions and Prophecies; because they are Representations and Charges, made to him by Angels. The Scene of these Visions

is

is *Arcadius*; and that we may be assured, that this Author would be taken for a Prophet, and would have his Book pass for a Divine Revelation: he introduces the Angel (in his 2*d Vision*, *Chap.* 4.) as commanding him, that he should prepare 3 Copies of these Visions; one for *Clement* then Bishop of *Rome*, to be sent by him to all the Churches; another for *Grapte*, who should instruct out of it the Widows and their Children; the third *Hermas* himself was to read to the Presbyters of the City of *Rome*. This is the Book and Author, in which Dr. *Bull* finds (or thinks he finds) some Passages in favour of our Saviour's Divinity; as I said at first, we must carefully examine what is the true Character of this Work and Writer.

By what has been said, it is evident to every one; that this (pretended) *Hermas* either was a Prophet or an Impostor: there is no Middle between these two, when the Person pretends to Visions, to Conferences with Angels, and such like extraordinary things. That the (pretended) *Hermas* was not a Prophet, is certain to me, by these Arguments. 1. He owns, in the third *Command*, that he was a most egregious, and common Liar: he saith expressly, that he scarce ever spake a true Word in his whole Life, but *always* lived in Dissimulation. and that to *all* Men. He weeps hereupon; and doubts, whether he can be saved: but his Angel assures him, that if for the time to come he will leave off his Lying, he may attain to Blessedness. He that was so addicted to lying, 'tis no wonder that he has counterfeited also Visions and Colloquies with Angels; or that to gain Credit to his Chimeras and Follies, he father'd them on *Hermas* an Apostolical Man and Friend of St. *Paul*, as others before him had laid their spurious Off-springs to the Apostles themselves. But, 2. Some of his (Celestial) Visions contain manifest Falshoods; particularly, he maketh his Angel to tell him, that *the whole World is made up of twelve Nations*, *Simil. 9. Chap.* 17. Being a Person altogether ignorant of secular Learning, as appears in all his three Books, 'twas almost impossible, but that in his feigned Conferences with Angels he should sometimes make them to speak divers things both false and absurd. 3. To add no more on this Trifler; he has been judged to be no Prophet, by the whole Catholick Church, in that his Book is not reckoned among the Canonical Books of Scripture: were it a real Revelation from God, by the Ministry of Angels, as the Author pretends; and so esteemed by the Catholick Church; it must have been put among the Canonical Books. It is true, when it first appeared, it imposed on some Churches, by the Boldness of its Pretence; and therefore was read in those Churches, as other genuine Parts of Scripture were: but even then, very many of the more Judicious rejected it; and as the Church began to fill with learned and able

Perſons, it was not only every where laid aſide, but cenſured as both falſe and fooliſh. Of ſo many of the Antients as condemned it, we need only take notice of *Euſebius*; who, ſpeaking of the Books uſed by Chriſtians, whether privately or in publick, ſays; " Some Books are re-
" ceived *by common Conſent of all*;
" others are *of queſtioned and doubt-*
" *ful Authority*; and finally others
" are ſuppoſititious and counterfeit,
" of which laſt kind (ſaith he) are
" the Acts of *Paul*, the Revelation
" of *Peter*, *the Shepherd of* Hermas,
" and the pretended Epiſtle of *Bar-*
" *nabas*. *Euſeb. H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 25.

Dr. *Bull*'s third Author is *Ignatius*: but neither is this Writer a whit better or honeſter, than the *pretended Barnabas*, or the *counterfeit Hermas*. I do not mean to deny, that we have ſtill the Epiſtles that are quoted by the Antients (*Origen* and *Euſebius*) under the Name of *Ignatius*: but this I affirm, that they were forged under *Ignatius* his Name, about the time that ſo many other Impoſtures were publiſhed under the Names of Apoſtles, and of Apoſtolical Men; of which, the Learned know, there were almoſt an infinite Number.

Let us ſee, firſt, what the Criticks of the contrary Perſwaſion, have to alledg for the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*; we may hear Mr. *Du Pin* for them all, becauſe he has written laſt, and more largely than any other. He obſerves that St. *Polycarp*, being thereto deſired by the Philippians, ſent them the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*; to which he alſo prefixed an Epiſtle of his own, directed to the ſame Philippians. Well, we acknowledg that *Polycarp*, writing to the Philippians, tells them towards the Cloſe of his Epiſtle, that he had ſent them (according to their Deſire) the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, that had by any means come to his Knowledg or Hand. He adds, that in theſe Epiſtles, " *Ignatius* treats *of*
" *Faith and Patience, and all other*
" *things that tend to Edification in*
" *Chriſt*. But here, two Doubts ariſe. Firſt, whether the Epiſtles that we *now have*, were the ſame that are intended in the Epiſtle of *Polycarp*, or ſo much as directed to the ſame Perſons or Churches? The Reaſon of the doubt is, the Epiſtles that we now have, treat of nothing leſs than *Faith and Patience*, nay they treat not of Faith and Patience at all; much leſs (if it could be) are they a Collection of *all things that tend to Edification in Chriſt*; they are very far from being a kind of *Summary of the Chriſtian Doctrine*, either in Faith or Morals. They are Letters of Compliment and Reſpect, not of Inſtruction or Exhortation. The other Doubt is, of what Authority and Credit is this Epiſtle of *Polycarp*; on which the Credit of the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* wholly depend? Mr. *Du Pin* anſwers; It is quoted by St. *Ireneus*. Suppoſing now, what Mr. *Du Pin* has not proved, nor can prove; that the Epiſtle of *Polycarp* intended by *Ireneus*, is (in part) that Epiſtle of *Polycarp* which we *now have*, becauſe

cauſe both the one and the other are directed to the Philippians: I ſay, ſuppoſing this; yet divers learned Criticks are of opinion, that the genuine Epiſtle written by the true *Polycarp*, and which *Ireneus* intends, concludes with the 12*th* Chapter; where he ſolemnly gives them his *valedictory Bleſſing:* ſo that the following Chapters which ſpeak of *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, and other Matters, have (probably) been added by him (whoever he was) who contrived Epiſtles in the Name of *Ignatius*. No, ſays Mr. *du Pin*, nor can *that* be; for *Ireneus* (who praiſes that Epiſtle of *Polycarp*) quotes alſo certain Words, which are found in the very Epiſtles of *Ignatius*. But I do not know that *Ireneus* quotes any Epiſtle of *Ignatius*, or ſo much as names the Man; but only repeats a Saying of a certain Chriſtian Martyr, which Saying the Forger of the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* thought fit to inſert into thoſe Epiſtles, which himſelf wrote in the Name and Perſon of *Ignatius*. In ſhort, I ſay, *Euſebius*, and before him *Origen*, owned the preſent Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, becauſe they conſidered the Matter but lightly; as not being any way concerned to diſprove them. And *Ireneus* (older than they) quotes an Epiſtle of *Polycarp* to the Philippians; as alſo (elſewhere) ſome Words that are now found in an Epiſtle imputed to *Ignatius:* but ſuppoſing that we *now have* that Epiſtle of *Polycarp*, yet it ſeems likely that the Epiſtle did then conclude with the 12*th* Chapter, without any mention of the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*; and we cannot be aſſured that *Ireneus* quotes the Words of one of the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, rather than that the Forger of thoſe Epiſtles borrowed thoſe Words from *Ireneus*.

If it be ſaid; but why all this Suſpiciouſneſs? it will be hard to prove any Matter of Fact, of remote Ages; if ſuch cloſe and ſtrict Proofs be required. I anſwer; there is too much Cauſe to ſtart theſe Doubts and Suſpicions. For we have the Epiſtle of *Polycarp* to the Philippians, as alſo the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, and the Martyrdoms of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, whereof the latter is contained in an Epiſtle (pretended to be written) by the Church of *Smyrna*; with this Advertiſement at the end of them: "This Epiſtle (concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*) was tranſcribed by *Caius*, from the Copy of *Ireneus*, who was a Diſciple of *Polycarp*. And I *Socrates* tranſcribed it at *Corinth*, from the Copy of *Caius*.——After which, I *Pionius* wrote it from the Copy before-mentioned, having *ſearched it out by the Revelation of* Polycarp, *who directed me to it*; having gathered *theſe things* together, now almoſt corrupted by Time, that Jeſus Chriſt may alſo gather me, together with his Elect ones.

Here then is an Epiſtle; namely, the Epiſtle of the Church of *Smyrna*, concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*; and as *the Advertiſement* ſaith, *other things that were almoſt corrupted*

thorow Proceſs of Time; namely, a Relation of the Martyrdom of *Ignatius*, and ſeven Epiſtles of *Ignatius*: all theſe miraculouſly diſcovered to *Pionius* (the good) by *Polycarp*, after his Death. It ſhould ſeem, *Polycarp* could not reſt, even in Reſt; nor be bleſſed, in Bleſſedneſs; till he had broke from the Abodes of Bliſs, and appeared to (honeſt) *Pionius*; to make known to him, where theſe *Golden Remains* were to be found. If we ſhould underſtand the Advertiſement ſo, as ſaying that the Epiſtle concerning *Polycarp*'s Martyrdom came to *Pionius* by Revelation; and the other Pieces and Epiſtles were collected by the proper Induſtry of *Pionius*: yet thus, the whole Collection depends on the Credit of *Pionius*; who with moſt, I doubt, has utterly ruined his Credit, as a Publiſher of antient Monuments, by his Pretence that (at leaſt) part of them are by Revelation. The Clowns will certainly cry out, Away with Impoſtors: let *Pionius* take his Bundle to himſelf, both his own Collection, and *Polycarp*'s Revelation; for coming from him, we muſt needs believe them to be true alike! Could not this Knave (will they ſay) be content, to perſonate *firſt* the Church of *Smyrna*, in a moſt *palpable* Fiction; *then* the Aſſiſtants at the Martyrdom of *Ignatius*, and finally *Ignatius* himſelf; but he muſt ſeek too to confirm his counterfeit Wares by Revelations from Heaven, by Viſions and Apparitions of departed Saints? We demand Authorities out of the Antients concerning the (pretended) Divinity of our Saviour, from Writings and Monuments that are verified by *ſome good humane Teſtimony*; our Oppoſers anſwer us out of Books, which ſome of their Fraternity received by Apparitions, *by Revelations from the Dead:* but if once we allow of ſuch Proofs, what end will there be of Fictions? The departed Saints were firſt called up, to bear witneſs to certain Epiſtles and Books: but in the next Age, when the firſt Cheat had taken with many; they were made to witneſs to their Bones and Reliques, in order to their being *inſhrined and worſhipped*; this laſt ſort of Apparitions were every whit as true, as the firſt. They will prove, they ſay, their (conſubſtantial co-eternal) Trinity, not only from the *Antenicene* Fathers; but from *the Apoſtolical Fathers*, that is the Fathers that had Converſe with the very Apoſtles, and flouriſhed (ſome of them) to the Year 150: but when theſe Authors are produced, they are *Barnabas* the Apoſtle, the Prophet *Hermas*, the Martyrdoms and Epiſtles of *Polycarp* and *Ignatius*; whereof the two former (we have ſeen) are rejected as ſpurious by the Catholick Church, the other are grounded on Viſions and Apparitions to one *Pionius*. But let us conſider the Contents of theſe (pretious) Pieces, the *Pionian* Κειμήλια.

The Martyrdom of *Polycarp* ſaith, "That when the Fire began to blaze "to a great height; *the Flame ma-* "*king an Arch, like the Sail of a* "*Ship*

" *Ship againſt a full Wind*, incom-
" paſs'd the Martyr's Body at a di-
" ſtance, without hurting it; while
" *from his Body proceeded a Smell*,
" *like to Frankincenſe, or ſome other*
" *rich Spices.* The firſt of theſe Mi-
racles would make *the Boys* wonder,
and ſhout; and was of no farther
Uſe: the other is yet more ſuſpicious,
for could not the Aſſiſtants diſtinguiſh
the Smell of Frankincenſe; no not
from any other of the Oriental Spices,
tho both *that* and *they* were every
day uſed (in thoſe times) in their
Funeral Piles? *But the Tale goes on*;
" When *the Wicked* ſaw, that the
" Martyr could not be hurt by the
" Fire, they commanded the Exe-
" cutioner to ſtick his Dagger into
" *Polycarp*, and ſo diſpatch him:
" which the Hangman preſently did;
" but behold two other Miracles,
" *and (believe me) as credible as*
" *either of the former.* For out of
" the Wound, which was in the
" Martyr's ſide, *ſprang a Live-dove*;
" and then, *ſuch a Torrent of Blood*
" (out of the Body of an old Man,
" upwards of 86 Years) *as wholly*
" *extinguiſhed all that great Fire.*
This *Text* needs no Comment.

The Martyrdom of *Ignatius* affords another *ſort* of Wonders, Apparitions and Viſions. For the Night in which he ſuffered, he appeared to the Chriſtians, who had aſſiſted at his Martyrdom: to ſome, *as one ſweating after hard Labour*; to others, *ſtanding by the Lord*, with much Aſſurance, and in unſpeakable Glory; but however, moſt courteouſly and lovingly *imbracing them all.* 'Tis *a Miracle*, to me, that he had not done ſweating, now that he was arrived at Bleſſedneſs; or do Souls (in their Etherial Vehicles) ſweat? But 'tis *a greater Miracle*, that appearing at Chriſt's right Hand in Heaven, he could at the ſame time imbrace (or ſeem to imbrace) thoſe upon Earth.

As to the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, conſidering by whom they are ſaid to be written, and to whom; they are more marvellous than the Martyrdoms. *Ignatius* was Biſhop at *Antioch*, where he was condemned to Martyrdom by the Emperor *Trajan*; but was ſent to *Rome*, (guarded by ten Souldiers) to ſuffer there, in the Amphitheater. In the Amphitheater the Condemned fought with Beaſts, Lions, Leopards, and ſuch like, till one or the other were killed. And for this Reaſon, they choſe out of the Priſoners of War, and the Condemned, the moſt robuſt young Men, that could make ſome Sport for the People, by the valiant Reſiſtance they made to the Beaſts. Therefore here are two things very incredible; that *Ignatius*, *a decrepid old Man*, for he had been a Biſhop above 40 Years, ſhould be condemned (contrary to Cuſtom, and to the Intention of thoſe Sports) *to fight the Lions.* And next, that in order thereto, he ſhould be ſent with ten Souldiers (*leſt he ſhould maſter, and get away from four or five*) to guard him, above 1500 Miles. To what purpoſe ſhould they be at ſo vaſt a Charge, eſpecially when it had been more proper.

per, and more effectual to their purpoſe, to execute him in his own City of *Antioch?* The (pretended) Epiſtles however ſuppoſe all this; they are written to divers Churches, as the Old Man paſſes from *Antioch* to *Rome*, *to fight the Lions:* and either theſe Epiſtles muſt be granted to be forged, or we muſt admit theſe (extravagant incredible) Suppoſitions. But the Epiſtles themſelves more plainly diſcover the Impoſture.

That to the *Romans* is chiefly, and almoſt wholly imployed, in adviſing and intreating the Chriſtians of *Rome*, that they ſhould not reſcue him from the Execution, but permit him to undergo his Sentence. The true *Ignatius* could never write ſuch an abſurd thing. Was it ever heard of, that Chriſtians attempted to reſcue their Martyrs; on the contrary, Martyrdom was reckoned (in thoſe days) the very higheſt Glory of a Chriſtian: and it was the Indeavour of Chriſtians who aſſiſted at Martyrdoms, to incourage the Martyrs, by all poſſible ways, to ſuffer couragiouſly; in ſhort, *they would as little have reſcued a Martyr, as they would have committed Sacrilege.* Beſides, were the Number and Power of the Chriſtians at *Rome*, in thoſe early times, ſo conſiderable, that they might reaſonably attempt ſo bold an Action, as to attack the Amphitheater, and the Imperial Guards, on behalf of a Priſoner? *Ignatius* perfectly knew the contrary to all this; and therefore could not be Author of an Epiſtle, which ſuppoſes theſe Follies.

The Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* is full of weak things. He tells them there, with equal Silline's and Falſhood, that the Virginity of *Mary*, her Delivery, and the Death of Chriſt, the three great Myſteries *(ſaith he)* of the Goſpel, *were kept concealed from the Devil*; and done in ſecret by God. He adds, that the Star, which appeared before our Saviour's Nativity, did *exceedingly outſhine the Sun, and all other Lights of Heaven. Pionius* did not conſider; that if ſo, it would not have been called a Star, but *another Sun:* and that there would have been no Night in *Judea*, till this Star diſappeared.

But ſee, how they have made a dying Man, a Biſhop and Saint of the firſt Age of Chriſtianity, complement with the Church of the Magneſians: "I have been judged worthy to ſee "you, by *Damus*, *your moſt excel-* "*lent Biſhop*; by your *very worthy* "*Presbyters*, *Baſſus* and *Apollonius*; "and by *my Fellow-Servant* Socio, "your Deacon: In whom I rejoice, "becauſe he is ſubject to his Biſhop "*as to the Grace of God*; and to "the Presbytery, *as to the Law of* "*Chriſt*. Who ſees not, that this is more like *a Maſter of the Ceremonies*, than an Apoſtolical Biſhop, and a primitive Martyr? In the ſame Epiſtle, he exhorts them not to obſerve the Sabbaths: but it is certain that the Sabbaths were obſerved, together with the Lord's Day, till after the Times of Great *Conſtantine*; it is not likely, the true *Ignatius* would oppoſe the Cuſtom and Practice

Practice of the Universal Church.

To the Trallians he saith, that the Deacons are to be reverenced *as Jesus Christ*; the Bishops, *as God the Father*; the Presbytery, *as the College of Apostles*. A complicated Blasphemy! He tells them afterwards, that their particular Bishop is such, that *his very Look is instructive*. He that writes thus of Bishops and Churchmen, must needs be *an approved Doctor*; but I dare almost to give them my corporal Oath, he never was a Doctor of the first Age.

Writing to the Philippians, he forgets not (his usual and constant Custom) to claw their Bishop. Your Bishop, *saith he*, is able to do more by his Silence, than others by their Speech. There are many Bishops still of this mind; but our Saviour's Motto was, *My Sheep hear my Voice*.

To the Smyrneans he says; "'Tis "a good thing to be subject *to God*, "*and to the Bishop*. Then he salutes *their very worthy Bishop*; their *venerable Presbytery*; your *Deacons my Fellow-Servants*; the *very excellent* Daphnus *and* Eutychus.

The last Epistle is to *Polycarp*; and tho he writes to a Bishop, not to a Church, he cannot forbear his (odious) Daubings. "He that thinks, "*says this Pseudo-Martyr*, that he "knows more than his Bishop, is "ruined: Hearken to the Bishop, "that God may hearken to you. In the Conclusion of this Epistle, as if he were a Prophet, he says; *my Grace be with* Attalus, *and with thee* Polycarp. A strain which, some will think, exceeds *the Fulness of the Apostolical Character*; which this Impostor assumes in the Epistle to the Trallians: I salute you, *saith he to the Trallians*, in the Fulness of the Apostolical Character. In short, no one can read these Epistles, with Judgment and impartially, but he will see, what was the Aim of the Forger of them; namely, under the venerable Authority and Name of *Ignatius*, to magnify the Reverence and Respect belonging to Church-men. This is the Beginning, Middle, and End of all these Epittles; except only that to the Romans; where (to cover his Design, and discover his Folly) he only advises the Christians, *not to rescue him from the Imperial Guards*.

These are all the Apostolical Fathers and Writings, that our Opposers can muster up, during the first 150 Years of Christianity; that is, to the Times, when the Socinians (and all Protestants) confess, that the Faith began to be actually corrupted. I have proved, that the Monuments they have to produce, are unquestionably and incontestably counterfeit; and therefore I do not think my self concerned, to examine the (few and impertinent) Passages, alledged out of them by Dr. *Bull*: but before I proceed to his other *approved Doctors*, 'tis but reasonable that I should have leave, to search what Authors and Books of these times, of which we are speaking, favoured the Unitarians; and particularly the Socinians. The Question

between

between Dr. *Bull*, and the Unitarians, is; what (genuine) Monuments or Remains there are, of the Period which Church-Hiſtorians have called *the Apoſtolical Succeſſion:* that is, of the Time in which thoſe Doctors of the Church, who had converſed with the Apoſtles, and received the pure Faith of the Goſpel from their very Mouths, flouriſhed? And whether thoſe Remains or Monuments do favour the Unitarians, or the Trinitarians; whether they teach the Doctrine of one God, or of three? We have ſeen what Dr. *Bull* can produce for their (pretended) Trinity; his Apoſtle *Barnabas*, the Prophet *Hermas*; both of them rejected, as falſe and fooliſh, by the Catholick Church: Next, the Revelations of *Pionius*; that is, the Martyrdoms of *Polycarp* and *Ignatius*, and their Epiſtles, all which being almoſt periſhed and worn out by Time, were revealed to *Pionius* by one from the Dead. It is true, our Oppoſers having been ſo long Maſters, have made uſe of their Power, to deſtroy and aboliſh (as much as was poſſible) whatever Monuments of thoſe firſt Times, that (too notoriouſly) contradicted the Innovations in the Faith, that were made by the Councils of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon:* yet as there is no Battel ſo bloody and cruel, but ſome (tho it may be a very few) have the good luck to eſcape from the Maſſacre; ſo from this Perſecution of Books and Writings, ſome (illuſtrious) Teſtimonies and Witneſſes to the Truth, are come down even to our Times. Theſe are, the Apoſtles Creed; an unqueſtioned Epiſtle, of St. *Clemens Romanus*; the Accounts given (by unſuſpected Hiſtorians) of the Nazarens or Ebionites, the Mineans, and the Alogi, who all held as the Socinians now do, concerning God and the Perſon of our Saviour; the Recognitions of St. *Clemens*, which tho. (it may be) they are not rightly imputed to him, yet are a moſt antient Book, and ſerve to ſhow what was the current Doctrine of thoſe Times; they are cited by *Origen* in divers Places, by *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, and others.

Of the Apoſtles Creed.

COncerning the Apoſtles Creed, we muſt reſolve two Queſtions: What it teaches; and who were the Compilers of it? To the firſt, the Creed it ſelf anſwers; "I "believe in *one* God; *ſo this Creed was antiently read both in the Eaſt and Weſt*; "the Father, Almighty, "Maker of Heaven and Earth. In theſe Words the Father is character'd by theſe Names, Properties and Attributions; that he is *God*, the *one* God, *Almighty*, and *Maker of Heaven and Earth.*

Con-

Concerning the Lord Chriſt, it ſaith; "And in Jeſus Chriſt, his "*only* Son (Gr. μονογενῆ, *only be-*"*gotten* Son) our Lord. So the Characters of our Saviour, are; that he is (not the one God, but) the *only begotten* Son of the *only* (or one) God, and that he is *our Lord*. Our *Lord* he is, as he is our Saviour, Teacher, and Head of the Church both in Heaven and Earth. He is called the *only begotten* Son of the only (or *one*) God, to diſtinguiſh him from all other Sons of God; from Angels, who were (not begotten, but) *created* Sons; from Holy Men, who are *adopted* Sons; and from *Adam*, who is called the Son of God, not becauſe he was generated or *begotten*, but *made* or formed by God himſelf immediately. Well, but it may be this only-begotten Son of God, is an only-begotten Son in ſome higher Senſe; and namely, by eternal Generation, from the Subſtance or Eſſence of God; whereby he is God, no leſs than the Father is God. But the Compilers of this Creed knew nothing, or however have ſaid nothing, of any ſuch Generation: ſo far from that, they deſcribe his Generation, and his Perſon, *by humane Characters*, and *by ſuch only*. Every thing that they ſay here, either of his Perſon or Generation, is not only humane; but *inconſiſtent with Divinity*. He was conceived (ſay they) of the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin *Mary*; was crucified, dead, and buried; he aroſe again from the Dead, aſcended into Heaven; ſitteth on the right Hand of God, *i. e. is next in Dignity to God*. Our very Oppoſers confeſs, that every one of theſe is a Deſcription of a mere humane Perſon, and Generation: even *they* acknowledg, that God cannot be conceived, be born, die, aſcend; and leaſt of all, be at God's right Hand, or *next to God*: to be *God* and *next to God*, are wholly inconſiſtent.

There is no anſwering here; that the (before-mentioned) are intended, only as the Characters of our Saviour's Humane Nature. For a Creed being an Inſtitution (or Inſtruction) what we are to believe in the main and fundamental Articles of Religion; eſpecially concerning the Perſons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: if the firſt is deſcribed as the one (or *only*) God; and the Son, only by Characters that ſpeak him a mere Man, and are utterly incompatible with Divinity; it remains, that the Compilers of the Creed, really intended, that we ſhould believe the Father is the one God; and the Son a *mere* Man, tho not *a common* Man, becauſe conceived (not of Man but) of the Holy Spirit, which is the Power and Energy of God. If they had meant, or but known, that the Son and Spirit are *eternal and divine Perſons*, no leſs than the Father; they have done to both of them the greateſt (poſſible) Wrong: becauſe in the ſame Creed in which they declare, that they believe that the Father is the *one* God, Almighty, and Maker of Heaven and

Earth; they believe the Son was conceived, born, died, deſcended into Hell, aſcended into Heaven, is *next to God*, that is, they believe he is *a mere Man*; and concerning the Spirit they believe no higher thing, than of the Church, we believe *in the Holy* Spirit and *in the Holy* Catholick Church. It is evident then, and inconteſtable by any fair and ſincere Conſiderer; that whoever made this Creed, either they did not know that any other Perſon but the Father is *God*, or *Almighty*, or *Maker of Heaven and Earth*: or they have negligently or wickedly concealed it. The Latter is a Suppoſition, that none will make; therefore the other is the Truth of the Matter: and it remains only, that we enquire, who were the Framers of this Creed?

The Creed that bears the Name of the Apoſtles Creed, was always reckoned both by Fathers and Moderns, to be really compoſed by the Apoſtles; for a Rule of Uniformity among themſelves in their Preaching, and of Faith to all the Converts: till about the middle of this preſent Age, *G. J. Voſſius* publiſhed a Book, wherein he denies, that either the Apoſtles, or the 120 Diſciples (who are mentioned *Acts* 1. 15. and who aſſiſted and voted with the Apoſtles in publick Matters) were Authors of this Creed. He thinketh, it was only the Creed of the particular Church of *Rome*; and that the Original of it was this. Becauſe it was the Cuſtom to interrogate Perſons that were to be baptized, whether they believed in God the Father, in the Lord Chriſt the Son of God, and in the Holy Ghoſt; in whoſe Names Baptiſm is adminiſtred; therefore in proceſs of Time it became a Form of Confeſſion, for Perſons who were admitted to Baptiſm, to ſay; I believe in God the Father, in Jeſus Chriſt his only-begotten Son, and in the Holy Ghoſt. Afterwards, ſome few more Words were added to theſe, as a fuller Deſcription both of the Father and Son: and as Hereſies grew up, new Articles were added to the Creed, in oppoſition to them; and to diſtinguiſh Catholicks from Hereticks. Againſt all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks in general, this Article was made; *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*: againſt the Sects of the Gnoſticks, this Article, *I believe the Reſurrection of the Body*. This is the Conjecture of *Voſſius*.

Becauſe it was ſo evident, that this Creed makes only the Father to be God; and that it ſpeaks of the Son, by only *humane Characters*, and ſays not the leaſt Word of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit: therefore this Book of *Voſſius* was received with a mighty Applauſe, among all the Denominations of Trinitarians; Papiſts, Lutherans, Calviniſts, and all others. They ſaw themſelves delivered by this Book, from ſuch an Allegation and Authority againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity; as was more than equivalent, to all their (pretended) Proofs from the Fathers, or from the Holy Scriptures. For what are all the Fathers, if indeed they were all of their

ſide;

ſide; when oppoſed by the College of Apoſtles? And what are ſome incidental and very dubious Expreſſions, of ſome particular Writer of Holy Scripture; againſt a Creed, compoſed by the Concurrence and Conſent of all the Apoſtles, and of their Senate (or Council) the CXX? A Creed, in which they, not incidentally (in which caſe, Men often ſpeak looſly and incorrectly) but *profeſſedly* and *deſignedly* declare, what is the true Faith to be believed by all Chriſtians concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I ſay, for this Reaſon 'tis not to be much wondred, that *Voſſius* his Book was ſo kindly received; or that the Trinitarians, of whatſoever Perſwaſion, have (generally) ever ſince followed the Conjecture of *Voſſius*. If now and then *a learned Man* has diſſented from the new Opinion; he has always been laugh'd out of Countenance by the Croud of *Pretenders to Learning*. *Voſſius* ſays;

1. St. *Luke*, in his *Acts* of the Apoſtles, would never have omitted ſo memorable a Tranſaction; as the compiling a Creed by all the Apoſtles, for a Rule of *Doctrine* to themſelves and their Succeſſors in the Paſtoral Office, and of *Faith* to the Converts. He has ſet down many leſſer Matters, the Election of *Matthias* into the Apoſtolate of *Judas*; the Concluſion of the Apoſtles and Elders, aſſembled in Council, concerning the Ritual and Judicial Parts of the Moſaick Law; and even divers petty Matters, relating only to *private* Perſons: and is it credible, that he ſhould not ſay a Word of *the Rule of Faith*; of *a Creed*, made by the joint Conſent of all the Apoſtles, and intended for the general and perpetual Uſe of both Paſtors and People? But beſides that this Creed is never ſpoke of, in the *Acts*; none of the Apoſtles mention, or ſo much as allude, or refer to it, in any of their Epiſtles: it is incredible, not to ſay impoſſible, that there ſhould not be ſo much as *a hint* given of this Creed, in all the Apoſtolick Writings; if indeed it had been compoſed by the Apoſtles, as their Joint Work, for the Uſe of the whole Catholick Church.

There are abundance of falſe Steps made, in this reaſoning of *Voſſius*. (1) It is evident enough, that divers moſt important Matters were ordained, by *the joint Council and Authority* of the Apoſtles and the CXX, which yet St. *Luke* did not think neceſſary to be inſerted, into his *Hiſtory of the Preaching, Travels, and Perſecutions of the Apoſtles*. The Inſtitution of the Lord's Day, inſtead of (or with) the Sabbath (or ſeventh Day) appointed by God himſelf in the 4*th* Commandment; the Form of Church-Government, whether you will ſay by Biſhops, or by a Presbytery, or in the Independent Way; the ſolemn manner of ordaining the Church-Paſtors, by Impoſition of Hands, and Prayer made for them; the Love-Feaſts, the Holy Kiſs: all theſe, every one will confeſs, are Inſtitutions, not of one Apoſtle, but of the College of Apoſtles and their

Council the CXX; and yet St. *Luke* has not told us, either *when* or by *whom* they were ordained, but is as ſilent of their Inſtitution by the Apoſtles, as of their compoſing the Creed. (2) 'Tis not hard to gueſs at the Reaſon, why none of theſe (great) Matters, or the compiling the Creed, are particularly recorded in the Acts of the Apoſtles; namely, becauſe they are not bare *Memoirs*, or tranſient things; but ſuch as were to be *kept up, and perpetuated, by Example and Practice.* Every one ſees, that the Lord's Day, the Form of Church-Polity or Government, the Ordination of Church-Paſtors, the Love-Feaſts, and the Holy Kiſs, are Inſtitutions that needed not to be recorded: becauſe the conſtant and univerſal Practice of them, by the Apoſtles and the whole Church, was more effectual to preſerve them, than any Regiſter or Hiſtory would be. The like is as evident, of the Creed; it was to be *orally taught* to every Convert, in every Place, as *the Mark of their Chriſtianity*: therefore being committed to ſo many Witneſſes and Memories, it was conſidered, not as a tranſient thing (of which there was Danger that it might go into Oblivion, if not recorded) but as laid up ſafely in the Minds and Memories of all the Faithful. Farther, 'tis an Obſervation made by all Church-Hiſtorians, that the Antients (of a long time) *purpoſely forbore* to commit the Creed to Writing; partly, becauſe they would not expoſe the Myſteries of Religion, to the Contempt, Raileries and Oppoſition of the Heathen: partly, to oblige their own People, to be more careful to learn it exactly. To this purpoſe, they cite, among divers others, the Teſtimony of St. *Jerom*, *Epiſt. ad Pam.* "In "the Creed, *ſays St.* Jerom *there*, "which is *not written with Ink and* "*Paper*; but on the (fleſhly) Ta-"bles of the Heart. (3) It is not true, what *Voſſius* adds, that the Apoſtles do not ſeem to allude or refer to this Creed, in any of their Epiſtles. St. *Paul* ſays, *Rom. 6. 17. Ye have obeyed (from the Heart) the Form of ſound Doctrine, which was delivered to you.* The τύπος διδαχῆς, *Exemplar* (or Form) *of Doctrine* (here) cannot be better interpreted, than of the common Creed.

It ſeems alſo to be meant, *Rom. 12. 6. Let him that propheſieth* (or, preacheth) *preach,* κατ' ἀναλογίαν πίστεως, *according to the Analogy* (or, the Rule) *of Faith.* The Scriptures of the New Teſtament not being yet written, the Chriſtian's *Rule of Faith* could be no other but the Creed; which (accordingly) by the moſt antient Fathers is expreſly called *Regula fidei, the Rule of Faith.*

1 Tim. 6. 20. *O* Timothy, *keep,* τὴν παραθήκην, *the Depoſitum,* (or, the thing committed to thy Truſt) *and turn not aſide.* The *Depoſitum* or *Truſt*, from which *Timothy* might not turn aſide, is (generally and very reaſonably) underſtood by Interpreters, to be the true Doctrine or *Faith* of the Goſpel: but if ſo, 'tis very probable, that the Apo-

Apoſtle intended more particularly *the Rule of Faith*, the Creed compoſed by all the Apoſtles.

2 *Tim.* 1. 13. "Hold faſt *the Form* "*of ſound Words*; which thou didſt "hear of me; *Heb.* 5. 12. Where- "as ye ought (for the time) to have "been Teachers; ye have need, that "one teach you again *the firſt Prin-* "*ciples* of the Doctrines (not, *the* "*Oracles*) of God; *Heb.* 6. 1. "Leaving *the Principles of the Do-* "*ctrine of Chriſt*, let us go on to "Perfection. Here *the Form of ſound Words*, and *the firſt Principles*, and again *the Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt*, are Expreſſions ſo (moſt properly) applicable to the Creed; that it was too much Boldneſs (or Inadvertence) in *Voſſius*, to affirm directly, that there is no Alluſion to the Creed in all the Apoſtolick Writings: one may ſay, they not only allude, but even point to it.

And what does St. *Jude* (ſo likely) mean, in theſe Words; *Jude* 3. "Earneſtly contend for *the Faith*, "*once delivered to the Saints*: for "there are certain Men crope in, "—denying *the only God*, *and our* "*Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. It is highly credible, that by *the Faith delivered to the Saints*, he means the Creed that was given out by the Apoſtles, to all their Churches. And does he not refer to the two firſt Articles of it, in theſe Words; for certain Men are crope in, *who deny the only* (or one) *God*, *and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*?

2. *Voſſius* his next Argument is yet more weak; nay, perfectly ridiculous. If this Creed, *ſaith he*, had been made (and ſo thought to be) by the Apoſtles; the Church would never have preſumed, to add any thing to it; and much leſs, to take ought from it.

I know not what he means, by taking ought from it; it doth not appear, that any thing has been taken from it: it is ſtill the ſame, for all that I know, or have ever read, as at firſt. But they would not have added; by this he means the Creeds of *Nice*, of *Conſtantinople*, and *Chalcedon*: by making of which Creeds, 'tis manifeſt that divers things were added to the firſt Creed, namely the Creed of the Apoſtles. I anſwer, (1) The Fathers in theſe Councils excuſed themſelves, by pretending, their Creeds were only *Explications of the antient Faith*, *or Creed*. They profeſſed, to keep cloſe to the Old Faith; without adding any thing to it: becauſe they added not any *new Articles*; but only more largely and fully explained the old ones. In ſhort, they came off from this Exception of *Voſſius*; as they thought; by calling their Additions, by the Name of Explications and Declarations, not of Additions. But (2) If they had directly ſaid; that they thought fit to inlarge the Creed made by the Apoſtles, by ſome other Doctrines taken from the New Teſtament: I do not think, that this is the worſt thing, of the kind, that Mother *Church* ever did. 'Tis known to all

the

the World, that ſhe has added to, and taken away, from the Sacraments and the Scriptures: therefore 'tis no ſuch great wonder, if alſo ſhe turned her own Doctrines into Creeds; and mingled her Articles, with the Articles of the Apoſtles.

From the Sacrament of the Supper, ſhe hath taken away the Cup; and in the ſame Sacrament has changed unleavened Bread into leavened. The Sacrament of Baptiſm ſhe hath wholly changed, turning it into the mimical Rite of *ſprinkling*; and alſo *added* the Croſs, to that (falſe) Baptiſm which ſhe adminiſters.

As for the Scriptures, all learned Criticks (even of the Trinitarian Perſwaſion) agree, that abundance of Words, and ſome whole Texts have been added. 'Tis unconteſtable, that they have added; *there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the WORD, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three are one.* It was expreſly denied at the firſt Council of *Nice* it ſelf, that the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid, *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, GOD was manifeſted in the Fleſh*; but, *which* (which Myſtery) was manifeſted, *by* Fleſh; namely, by the Lord Chriſt, and the Apoſtles. And to omit many other (certain and yielded) Depravations of Scripture, both by adding and omitting: there are ſhrewd Preſumptions, that to the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, by our Saviour, in the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*; theſe Words have been added, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* It appears in the Acts, and Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, that the Apoſtles never baptized in that Form of Words, but only *in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* But we need no more but the Teſtimony of one of their own Hiſtorians, St. *Epiphanius*; concerning the Fidelity of *the Church* (as the prevailing Party always calls it ſelf) in preſerving pure and intire the Oracles of God. *Epiphanius* owns in direct terms, that the Orthodox put out of their Bibles ſome Paſſages of Scripture, which they liked not: and the Bibles of his time, that had not been ſo uſed, this good Father (roundly) calls them, *the Bibles that have not been rectified.* Ancor. n. 31.

3. *Voſſius* ſaith farther, that none of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, tho they have ſet down the Creeds made in Councils, have recorded the Creed of the Apoſtles: thus *Socrates* and others regiſter not only the Creeds made in legitimate Councils, but even thoſe by the Arian Councils; but they have not a Word of the Apoſtles Creed. To this, I ſay, 1. *Socrates*, and the Hiſtorians that follow him, begin their Hiſtories (at ſooneſt) no higher, than the Converſion of Great *Conſtantine* to the Chriſtian Faith. Therefore 'tis no wonder, that tho they record the Creeds in order, as they were compoſed by the Councils that aſſembled under Great *Conſtantine*, and his Succeſſors: yet they ſay nothing of the Apoſtles Creed, which belonged to a Period

300 Years older than the times of which those Historians write. 2. *Vossius* has not asked; why *Eusebius*, the oldest of the Ecclesiastical Historians, and who begins his History from the very first, has not mentioned or recited the Apostles Creed; because he foresaw, it would be answered; that *Eusebius* was a thorow-paced Arian, a great Opposer of *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra* (against whom also he particularly wrote) who held the Doctrine that the Socinians now do; therefore perceiving that the Apostles Creed was as much against the Arians as the Homo-ousians, and that it wholly favoured *Marcellus*, he forbore to take notice of it in his History. I shall grant, that *Eusebius* was a most learned Historian, and that we are extremely in his debt, for the Collection of antient Monuments and Memoirs he has left to us: but I could give, and hereafter shall give, divers Instances, of his designed suppressing whatsoever of Antiquity, that favoured the Nazarene and Minean (or as we now speak, the Socinian) Doctrine.

4. The last Argument of *Vossius*, is propounded by (the present famous) Monsieur *du Pin* (in his *Eccl. Hist. c.* 1. *p.* 9.) in more advantageous Terms and Manner than by *Vossius*: I will therefore examine it, as Mr. *du Pin* has offer'd it. He says, that 'tis an Opinion establish'd on very good Grounds, that this Creed was made by the Apostles: but that they wrote, or dictated it, *word for word, just as we now have it*; he thinks is very improbable. He chose to propound his Opinion, after this fallacious manner, that he might not be talk'd of (it may be, be censured by his Superiours) for maintaining *in terminis* an Opinion, which might be judged to be heretical. For in very deed, Mr. *du Pin* does not only *not believe*, that the Apostles wrote this Creed *word for word*, as we now have it; but he thinks, they were not Authors of it at all, in any Sense; according to him, the Apostles neither made, nor designed to make a Creed. He saith indeed, that 'tis an Opinion establish'd on very good Grounds, that the Apostles made this Creed; and the Proposition he undertakes to prove, is only this, that *the Apostles did not write this Creed word for word, just as we now have it*: but his Arguments (which are the same with those of *Vossius*) aim at this; that the Apostles neither wrote, nor intended to write any Creed at all. I have already considered all his Arguments, but only the last; which both he and *Vossius* (seem to) suppose, to be the strongest: in truth, it is the weakest, as being made up of Accounts that are (too notoriously) false; it is this.

If the Apostles had made a Creed, saith Mr. *du Pin*, it would have been found *the same* in all Churches, of all Ages: all Christians would have learnt it by Heart; all Churches, and all Writers, would have repeated it, in the same manner and in the same terms. But the contrary is evident, for not only in the 2*d* and 3*d* Centuries,

ries, but in the *4th* also there were many Creeds; and all, tho the same as to Doctrine, yet different in the Expression. In the *2d* and *3d* Ages we find as many Creeds as Authors: which shows that there was not then any Creed that was reputed to be the Apostles; or even any regulated or establish'd Form of Faith. For *Ireneus* exhibits one Creed, *lib.* 1. *c.* 2. and another, *lib.* 1. *c.* 19. *Tertullian* makes use of *three* several Creeds, in his Books *de Præscriptione*, *contra Praxeam*, and *de Virgin. velandis.* See also *Origen peri Archon*, *lib.* 1. *& Dial. contr. Marc.* *Ruffinus* in the *4th* Age, compares *three* antient Creeds, of *Aquileia*, *Rome*, and the Orient; none of which agree perfectly with the common one, nor with one another: as will appear (saith he) by the Table, containing the 4 Creeds, at the End of this Discourse. St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* (in his Catechetick Lectures) gives us a particular Creed, used by the Church of *Jerusalem*, when this Father wrote. The Authors also that have explained the Creed, as St. *Austin*, *Serm.* 119. St. *Maximus*, *Chrysologus*, *Fortunatus*, omit some Expressions that are found in the Apostles Creed *as we now have it*; as *the Life everlasting*: and St. *Jerom* says, that the Apostles Creed concludes with *the Resurrection of the Body*; but now it concludes with the *Life everlasting*. Lastly, he saith, that *Ruffinus* is the first, and only Person of the *5th* Century, who asserts that the Creed was composed by the Apostles; and he proposes his Opinion, only as a Matter that depended *on popular Tradition*: the other Authors that are of this Opinion, *he saith*, took it up on the Credit of *Ruffinus*; and are too late in time, to be admitted as Witnesses in this Question, about the Authors of the Creed called the Apostles.

Never was there less Truth, in so many Words; I shall therefore discuss very particularly, all that he hath said. He saith; (1) If the Apostles had made a Creed, all *Churches* and all *Writers* would have repeated it, in the same Manner and Terms. That all *Churches* repeated it in the same Terms and Manner, we affirm; nor will Mr. *du Pin* ever prove the contrary. That all *Writers* should repeat it in the same Manner and Terms, is a childish Supposition: for sometimes they have occasion to repeat but *part of it*; sometimes they repeat it *Paraphrastically*, thereby to put on it their own Interpretation. Therefore 'tis but weakly urged by Mr. *du Pin*, that *Ireneus* gives us *two* Creeds, *Tertullian three*, *Origen* yet *another*: for of these Writers, *Tertullian* (*de Virgin. veland.*) designed to repeat but only a part of the Creed; the same *Tertullian* (*de Præscript. & contr. Prax.*) as also *Ireneus* and *Origen* repeat the Creed Paraphrastically or Exegetically, that their Reader might take it in their Sense. 'Tis to no purpose, that Mr. *du Pin* urges the Creed in St. *Cyrill*, used in the Church of *Jerusalem*; for no Body denies that after the

Coun-

Council of *Nice* (that is, after the Year 325.) the Nicene Creed, and the Creeds made in imitation of *that*, were explained in many Places to the Youth and Catechumens, inſtead of the Apoſtles Creed; that People might be infected betimes, with that Infidelity which the Nicene Council had eſtabliſh'd and publiſh'd.

But whereas he has given us a Table of 4 Creeds; namely, the Vulgar, the Aquileian, that of *Rome*, and that of the Orient: We ought to thank him, for (implicitly) giving up the Queſtion to us. The Reader is to know, that by *the Orient* (in the Age of *Ruffinus*, from whom Mr. *du Pin* takes the Aquileian, Roman and Oriental Creeds) was meant the *Eaſtern Part* of the Roman Empire; namely, all the Provinces, that ſpoke the Greek Tongue; which is to ſay, all *Illyricum* and *Grecia*, the Kingdoms and Provinces of *Aſia*, the Provinces and Kingdoms of *Syria*, as far as the *Euphrates* and *Tigris*, *Egypt*, the Iſlands in the *Archipelago*, *Adriatick* and *Ionian* Seas; all theſe (being the better Moiety of the Roman Empire) were called *the Orient*. The Church of *Rome*, tho ſhe was not (as ſhe now calls her ſelf) *the Miſtreſs*; yet being the Patriarchal Chair of all *the Weſt*, ſhe was *the Example* of the Churches of the Weſt Part of the Empire. I affirm now, that theſe two Creeds, as alſo that of *Aquileia*, perfectly agree with the Vulgar; by which he means the Apoſtles Creed as we now have it. Mr. *du Pin*'s Table, which we confeſs to be exact enough, will ſhow us no Difference, but what will confirm every intelligent Reader, that without peradventure they are all but one Creed, made by the ſame Author or Joint-Authors. There is more Difference between the ten Commandments, as recited by *Moſes* at *Exod.* 20. and as repeated again by the ſame *Moſes* at *Deut.* 5. than between theſe Creeds: Mr. *du Pin* will ſooner perſwade a prudent Reader that the 10 Commandments in *Deuteronomy* were not the Commandments ſpoke on Mount *Sinai*, and recorded *Exod.* 20. than that the 4 Creeds in his Table are not the ſame, or came not from the ſame Hands.

The whole Difference of the 4 Creeds conſiſts in theſe (unſignificant) Words and Expreſſions. The Oriental Creed ſaid, I believe in *one* God, the Father, Almighty, *Inviſible and Impaſſible*. The Roman, I believe in God the Father Almighty: and the Aquileian ſaid; I believe in *one* God, the Father, Almighty: the preſent (or Vulgar) Creed adds, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*.

The Roman, and Aquileian, and Preſent, ſay; And in Jeſus Chriſt his only Son our Lord: the Oriental tranſpoſes the word *only*, thus; and in our *only* Lord Jeſus Chriſt, his Son.

The Oriental, Roman and Aquileian ſaid; who was born of the Holy Ghoſt and of the Virgin *Mary*: the Preſent, by way of Explication; who was *conceived* of the Holy

Ghoſt, born of the Virgin *Mary*.

The Oriental and Roman ſaid; was crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, and was buried: the Aquileian, crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, buried, *deſcended into Hell*: the Preſent, crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, *dead*, buried, deſcended into Hell. But *deſcendit ad inferos*, *he deſcended to thoſe below*, or as we render it *into Hell*, is confeſs'd on all Hands to be an accidental Addition in the Creed of *Aquileia*; and from that Creed was taken into the Preſent Creed, on this Occaſion. In ſome Churches it was ſaid, *was buried*; in others, *went to thoſe below*; which (every one ſees) are equivalent Expreſſions, and intended to ſignify the ſame thing: but the Church of *Aquileia* deſiring that her Creed ſhould be moſt full and compleat, took in both the Expreſſions; tho at the ſame time (as *Ruffinus*, who was of *Aquileia*, acknowledges) ſhe meant no more by both, than other Churches by the ſingle word *buried*. And hence it was, that the other Churches and Copies of the Creed, which ſaid *deſcended into Hell* (or deſcended *to thoſe below*) did omit *buried*: and ſo, at this day, doth the Athanaſian Creed. But it was not long before this Variety of expreſſing the ſame thing, begat Miſtakes: for by occaſion of this Expreſſion *deſcended to thoſe below*, divers began to imagine a local Deſcent of Chriſt into Hell. Some of them ſaid, to triumph over the Devil; others ſaid, to releaſe thoſe Damned who believed and repented at the ſight of him; others had ſtill other (as ungrounded) Conceits. But the Diſputes about *the Reaſons* of our Saviour's Deſcent *to thoſe below*, made the Article (taken in general) to be believed; and therefore it was added at laſt to the Roman Creed, which with this and ſome other Alterations, makes the Vulgar or *Preſent* Creed.

All the Creeds ſay; the third Day he aroſe again from the Dead.

The Oriental, Roman and Aquileian ſaid; he aſcended into Heaven, ſitteth on the right Hand of God, the Father: the *preſent*, to the word Father, adds the word *Almighty*.

They all ſaid; from thence he ſhall come, to judg the quick and the dead. The Oriental, Roman and Aquilean ſaid; And in the Holy Ghoſt: the Preſent, more explicitly, *I believe* in the Holy Ghoſt. The Oriental, Roman and Aquileian ſaid; I believe the Holy Church, the Communion of Saints: the Preſent to the word *Church*, adds the word *Catholick* or Univerſal.

All the Creeds ſaid; the Forgiveneſs of Sins.

In like manner, they all ſaid; the Reſurrection of the Body; ſaving that the Aquileian ſaid, of *this* Body.

The Preſent concludes with *the Life everlaſting*: the other *three* mention not the Life everlaſting; becauſe it is ſuppoſed and included in the foregoing Article, *the Reſurrection of the Body*.

I ſay now, let any one read the ten Commandments at *Exod.* 20. and compare them with the ſame ten Com-

Commandments at *Deut.* 5. and he will perceive, that he may better deny them to be the ſame Commandments, than that theſe four *various Copies* are Copies of the ſame Creed. The Variations of the 4 Copies are ſo inconſiderable, the Cauſes of that Variation ſo obvious and evident, that he that will call them, not *various Readings* of the ſame Creed, but 4 ſeveral Creeds proceeding from ſo many ſeveral Compilers, in my opinion ought (if obſtinate in his Error) to take Phyſick. But if theſe are only *various Readings of the ſame Creed*, without doubt we have gained our Point, that the Apoſtles were the Authors of it. For I deſire to know, how it was (morally) poſſible, that the *Eaſt* and *Weſt*; which is to ſay, all the Churches of *Chriſtendom*, ſhould in all Kingdoms, Provinces and Epiſcopates, happen to have the very ſame Creed, both for *Number* and *Order* of Articles, and *Manner of Expreſſion*; if they did not receive it from the very ſame Perſons, from whom they received the Goſpel and the Scriptures, namely from the Apoſtles and other firſt Miſſionaries and Preachers of the Heavenly Doctrine? It is granted to us, that there had been no General Council, when this Creed (as we have made it appear) was the *common* and *only* Creed both of the Weſt and Orient: therefore when all the Fathers (without excepting any) *that ſpeak of this Creed*, tell us, they have received *ex traditione Majorum* (*by Tradition of their Predeceſſors*) that this Creed was made by the Apoſtles; they give us ſuch an Account as juſtifies and proves its own Truth; for no other Cauſe can be thought of, how it ſhould become *the common and only Creed* of Chriſtians.

(2) Mr. *du Pin* ſaith; *Ruffinus* (in the 5*th* Century) is the firſt Perſon, who aſſerts that this Creed was compoſed by the Apoſtles; and that too *from popular Tradition*: indeed a great many other Fathers ſay the ſame thing; but they all had it from *Ruffinus*. Firſt, Mr. *du Pin* reckons *Ruffinus* to the 5*th* Century; only to leſſen his Authority and Credit in this Queſtion: for it is certain, (and acknowledged by Dr. *Cave*, and afterwards by Mr. *du Pin*) that *Ruffinus* flouriſh'd at *Aquileia* in the Year 360. at which Time and Place he had a great Friendſhip and Intimacy with St. *Jerom*. It is true, becauſe he lived to be old, he ſaw the Year of Chriſt 410 or 411. and from hence Mr. *du Pin* has taken occaſion, to call him a Father of the 5*th* Century. *Ruffinus* being the firſt of the Fathers, that ever wrote an Expoſition on the Creed; I mean, the firſt *of thoſe now extant*: 'tis no wonder that he is alſo the firſt that expreſly informs us, who were the Authors of it; tho if he had not told us, who were the Compilers, the Univerſality and Antiquity of it, are alone ſufficient to declare the Authors and Compilers. Nor does he ſay, that he had learned who were the Framers of the Creed, *by popular Report*; but *tradunt majores noſtri*, our Predeceſ-

fors (in the ſacred Function) have ſo delivered to us. Which is not to be underſtood neither, of bare *oral Tradition* by the preceding Biſhops and Presbyters; but of the antient Writers who had commented on the Creed, who (he ſaith) were very many. None of them are come down to our Times; but of the Number was *Photinus*, Archbiſhop of *Sirmium* and Metropolitan of *Illyricum*, who held as the Socinians now do, that the Lord Chriſt was a Prophet, not God. Whereas Mr. *du Pin* adds, that all the other Fathers (whom he confeſſes to be very many, he ſhould have ſaid, *All that mention this Creed*) took it on the Credit of *Ruffinus*, that the Apoſtles were the Compilers of it: it is raſhly ſaid, None of them quote *Ruffinus* for their Author; and divers of them (particularly St. *Auſtin*) alledg (as *Ruffinus* does) Tradition for their Ground; which, as I ſaid before, was not only *Oral Tradition*, but *the Tradition of the antient Commentators*. And when this Critick urges, in the laſt Place, that St. *Auſtin*, *Maximus*, and ſome others, who have expounded the Creed after *Ruffinus*, omit divers Words, nay and Expreſſions, that are found in the Creed *as we now* have it: why has he concealed, that the Words or Expreſſions omitted by theſe Expoſitors, are only ſuch, as they ſuppoſed to be included in other equivalent Expreſſions of the Creed? Tho it might alſo ſometimes happen, that they did not intend, to explain *the whole* Creed *verbatim*, but only the principal Words and Articles; namely, ſuch as either were controverted by Hereticks, particularly by the Gnoſticks and Manichees, or were miſunderſtood by Heretical Perſons. His Inſtance of *the Life everlaſting*, omitted by Expoſitors, will do him no Service: for 'tis not *an Article* (no more than *dead*, or *gone to thoſe below* are Articles) but only an Illuſtration or fuller Explication of the Article foregoing, *the Reſurrection of the Dead*.

Theſe are the Arguments of theſe two very learned Criticks (I willingly acknowledg them to be ſuch) *Voſſius* and Monſieur *du Pin*, againſt the Apoſtles Creed: I have (I think) not only fully ſatisfied them; but at the ſame time defended our Arguments, for it, againſt their Evaſions. For whereas to our Argument, from the Teſtimony of *all the Fathers who have ever ſpoke of this Creed*; and eſpecially of *Ruffinus*, a moſt learned and judicious Father, equalled by Mr. *du Pin* to St. *Jerom*; they reply, that *Ruffinus* was but of the 5*th* Age, and ſpoke only from popular Hearſay, and that all the other Fathers took it from him: I have ſhown, that theſe are partly untrue, partly raſh and ungrounded Affirmations. And whereas to what we alledg from the (confeſs'd) Antiquity, and the Univerſality of this Creed; they anſwer, the Creeds of the *Orient* and Weſt were different: I have evinced, that the (pretended) Differences are apparently only *the various Readings* of one and the ſame Creed; the

the very Commandments are (much) more differently related by *Moſes* himſelf, than the Apoſtolick Creed by the Churches.

Of St. Clemens.

OF the Monuments and Remains of the Apoſtolick Age, next to the Apoſtles Creed, is the Epiſtle of *Clemens Romanus* to the Corinthians. This is that *Clemens*, of whom St. *Paul* makes reſpectful Mention, *Phil.* 4. 3. He has written an Epiſtle, in the Name and by the Order of the Church of *Rome*, to the Church of *Corinth*. All the Criticks on the Fathers, when they ſpeak of this Epiſtle, without an Eye to the Trinitarian Controverſies, own, not only that 'tis unqueſtionably genuine, but that 'tis a moſt pious, moſt judicious, and an elegant Compoſition: Mr. *du Pin* very truly adds; "One "may diſcern in this Writer, a great "deal of Energy and Vigor, ac- "companied with much Prudence, "Gentleneſs, Zeal and Charity. But when they conſider the Doctrine of it, with regard to the Trinity, and the Perſon of our Saviour, the ableſt and antienteſt (and particularly great *Photius*, the moſt judicious Cenſor of the Fathers, and himſelf a Father) cannot mention it, without Tears in their Eyes. Beſides *Photius*, *Petavius* and *Huetius* (famous modern Criticks) ſigh it out, that *Clemens was an undoubted Unitarian*; and the occaſion of this Judgment is, becauſe of the low and merely humane Characters, which (throughout this Epiſtle, even where he affects to ſpeak of our Saviour in the higheſt manner) he gives of our Saviour's Perſon and Dignity. But I ſhall be more particular, than they have been, in referring to the Paſſages of this Epiſtle; which have ſo grieved the Trinitarian Criticks.

Firſt, he always diſtinguiſhes the Lord Chriſt from God; and often *ſo* diſtinguiſhes him, that it amounts to a flat and direct Denial, that he is God.

The Apoſtles, *ſaith he*, ch. 42. have preached to us, from our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and the Lord Chriſt from God. The Lord Chriſt then, according to St. *Clement*, was not himſelf God; but *one that has preached to us from God, as the Apoſtles preached from Chriſt.*

At *chap.* 58. he hath theſe (deciding) Words; "God the Inſpe- "ctor of all things, the Father of "Spirits, the Lord of all Fleſh; "*who hath choſen our Lord Jeſus* "*Chriſt, and us by him*; grant to "you Peace, Long-ſuffering, Pati- "ence, through *our High Prieſt and* "*Protector* Jeſus Chriſt: *by whom* "be Glory, and Honour, and Ma- "jeſty unto God, now and for ever- "more. What a Socinian Account

is

is here, of our Saviour? He is, ſaith St. *Clement*, *the choſen of God, as we alſo are*; our *High Prieſt* and *Protector*, by his effectual Prayers and Interceſſion for us: and let Honour, Glory and Majeſty, be *given to God, by him*, now and for ever. Did he think the Perſon, of whom he ſo ſpeaks, was himſelf God?

But when he intends to ſay a very high thing, of our Saviour; he calls him (at *ch.* 16.) *the Scepter of the Majeſty of God.* He alludes here to the Scepter of King *Ahaſuerus*, which he ſtretched out to Queen *Eſther*, in token of his Acceptance and Favour. The Lord Chriſt therefore, in the Doctrine of this Father, differs juſt ſo from God; as the Enſigns and Marks of Power and Majeſty, differ from that Majeſty and Power of which they are only the Marks and Signs.

But beſides theſe diminutive Expreſſions, and abſolutely inconſiſtent with our Saviour's being God; I obſerve, that when he endeavours moſt of all (at *ch.* 36.) to extol the real Greatneſs of our Saviour, he minds the Corinthians, that by him our Hearts and Underſtandings are inlightned and opened; meaning, *by his Doctrine and Goſpel*; and that *he is exalted above the Angels*: to which purpoſe he cites divers Expreſſions of the firſt Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. But tho he there goes over that whole Chapter, for the higheſt Epithets he might give to our Saviour, he omits the 8*th*, 9*th*, 10*th*, 11*th* and 12*th* Verſes; in which the Title *God* is beſtowed on him, and *the Creation of the Heavens and Earth* is (thought at leaſt to be) aſcribed to him. This makes me doubt, that thoſe Verſes were not originally in that Epiſtle; but have been ſince added. St. *Clement* endeavours there, to aſcribe to our Saviour all the moſt glorious Prerogatives and Pre-eminencies, that (with Truth) he could; he himſelf ſaith divers magnificent things of him: he begins alſo at the firſt Verſes of that firſt Chapter to the *Hebrews*, goes thorow the whole Chapter, and concludes with the laſt Verſes of it; and yet neither calls him *God*, nor imputes to him *the Creation of Heaven and Earth*; nay, of that whole Chapter he omits only thoſe five Verſes which ſo ſpeak of him, tho they were moſt of all to *Clement*'s Deſign and Aim. It is true, that in thoſe Verſes our Saviour is called *God* in no other Senſe, than *Solomon* was ſo called; for the Author uſes the very Words that the Pſalmiſt had uſed of *Solomon*; and the Heavens and Earth there meant, are only *the New Heavens and Earth* foretold by the Prophets, even the Goſpel-Oeconomy and State: yet theſe Characters of our Saviour are ſo noble, were ſo highly to *Clement*'s Purpoſe and Deſign, and it was ſo impoſſible for him (who went thorow the whole Chapter) to overlook them, that I cannot believe theſe Verſes were *then* a part of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, but (as many other Paſſages, both in the Goſpels and Epiſtles) have been fraudulently added. Or it may be,

be, they were at first a marginal Note, by some Copier; and being taken by succeeding Copiers as Words that had been overseen, and not as a Note or Annotation, were by them put into the Text it self of the Epistle. This Corruption might the more easily happen, without being opposed by any; because it was a long time (near, if not full 400 Years) before this Epistle was owned as a genuine part of Scripture, any where in the West, or in many Churches of the Orient. That which makes this Conjecture (that these Verses have been added to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*) still more probable, is, that those Antients who owned this Epistle as written by St. *Paul*, said, it was originally wrote by him in the Hebrew Tongue, and translated into Greek (as we now have it) by St. *Clement*, *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 3. Theophylact. Com. in C. 1. Epist. ad Hebr.* But if so; how can we think, that *Clement* should omit what was most for his Design, in an Epistle which himself had translated, and therefore was perfectly acquainted with it; and in a Chapter too, out of which he had cited so many Passages, that were much less to his purpose? The short is, St. *Clement* describes our Saviour, as the High Priest of the Priests of the New Testament: and when he had the fittest Occasion, and the greatest Opportunity, from an Epistle of St. *Paul*, which himself had translated into Greek, to call our Saviour *God* and *Creator*, he calls him neither; but only our High Priest, as St. *Paul* does throughout that Epistle. From whence, I say, we have these 2 (very probable) Consectaries; that neither did St. *Clement* think our Saviour to be *God* or *Creator*, in any Sense of those Words; nor were those 5 Verses of that Epistle of St. *Paul*, wherein Christ is so stiled, originally in that Epistle, but have been since added.

And hitherto of the Judgment of St. *Clement*. For tho something might be added out of a second Epistle, which also bears the Name of St. *Clement*, I shall omit it; partly, because the Epistle is rejected as counterfeit, by the most Learned of the Antients, *Eusebius*, St. *Jerom*, and *Photius*: partly because the Meanness of the Stile, the Driness and Flatness of the Thoughts, and the Inelegance of the Composition, most plainly discover, that it was none of St. *Clement*'s. *Eusebius* adds, that the Antients never alledg or cite the (pretended) second Epistle of *Clement*. *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 38.*

As to what Dr. *Bull* quotes out of the first Epistle, and indeavours to improve by paraphrasing (that is, *by wresting*) it; 'tis so trivial, as well as so remote, that I shall trust the Judgment of any (the meanest) Reader with it: but out of the 2d (counterfeit) Epistle, he has abused his Reader with a broken Citation, which may seem to his purpose, when indeed it is not. The Words are these, being the very first Words of the Epistle; "We ought (Brethren) "to think of Christ, as of God. It was knavishly done, to omit *the next* Words,

Words, which were designed by the Author, to explain these: "We "ought, *says this Pseudo-Clemens*, "to think of Christ as of God; as "the Judg both of the Dead and "Living. His Meaning therefore was; We ought (Brethren) to think of Christ, as we do of God; namely, that he also is our Judg. He himself has taught us, that *God hath committed to him all Judgment*, John 5. 22. And why; because he is God? No, but because he is Man: for so himself adds in that very Context; *God hath given to him to execute Judgment, because he is the Son of Man*, John 5. 27.

Out of the *9th* Chapter of the same Imposture, Dr. *Bull* alledges; *Jesus Christ being first a Spirit, was made Flesh.* He should not have left out the following Words; *so also shall we, in the Flesh, receive our Reward.* In both the Expressions he seems to design, that the Souls of Men being first created, are afterwards infused into Bodies. They are not *the Harmony of the Body*, nor *derived ex traduce*; but first really made and existent, and then incarnated by the Divine Power. But it is Dr. *Bull*'s constant Method, to omit what goes before or after; by which his Author's Intention may be cleared: or to feign (by occasion of some ambiguous preceding Passage) an Intention which was never in the Author's Mind; and by such (pretended) Intention to interpret the Places, either alledged by him, or objected to him. In short, his Reader can never rely upon his Quotations; but then least of all, when he falls to explaining or paraphrasing.

Of the Nazarens, Ebionites, Mineans.

LET us now proceed to the Nazarens, Mineans, Ebionites, and Alogians: concerning the former of which, Dr. *Bull* grants, that if the Nazarens (or Mineans) were indeed Unitarians, if these held that the Lord Christ was a Man only; the Question is at an end. He yields, that the Nazarens being the Christians of *Jerusalem* and *Judea*, who were converted by the Lord Christ and the Apostles, and flourished there under a Succession of 15 Bishops, whereof the first was St. *James* Brother of our Lord: if these believed, that Christ was a Man only, it will certainly follow, that the Article concerning our Saviour's Divinity can be no longer defended: *Judic. Eccl. p.* 42.

I do not thank him, for this Concession; for who sees not, that if the Churches of *Jerusalem* and *Judea*, planted by the Apostles, and which indured in a most flourishing Condition (under 15 successive Hebrew Bishops) to the times of the Emperor *Adrian*, were Unitarians; then is

is the Unitarian Belief concerning our Saviour, inconteſtably true, and the certain Doctrine of the Apoſtles? But before I argue this Point, it will not be unprofitable to the Reader, who is not verſed much in theſe Queſtions, if I give a ſhort Account of the Occaſion and Reaſon of theſe Names, *Nazaren*, *Minean*, *Ebionite*.

The followers of the Doctrine of Jeſus, were firſt called *Chriſtians* at *Antioch*; a City of *Syria*, out of the Bounds of *Judea*: but in *Judea* it ſelf, they were (from the firſt) called *Nazarens* and *Mineans*. *Nazarens*, from *Nazareth*, the Place of our Saviour's Education: *Mineans*, from an Hebrew Word which ſignifies *Hereticks*. *Tertullus*, when he accuſed *Paul* before *Felix*, makes this to be his Fault; that he was *a Ring-leader of the Sect of the Nazarens*, Acts 24. 5. To the other Name *Minean* or Heretick, St. *Paul* himſelf refers, in his Defence againſt the ſame *Tertullus*; "This I confeſs, ſaith *Paul*, "that after the way which they call "*Hereſy*, ſo worſhip I the God of "my Fathers: *Acts* 24. 14. Theſe two Names, *Nazaren* and *Minean*, are indifferently uſed by the Fathers in the following Ages, that is, they were applied to the ſame Perſons and Sect: ſo we learn from St. *Jerom*, writing to St. *Auſtin*, in theſe Words; "There is to this day over "*all the Orient*, a Jewiſh Sect, who "are called *Mineans*; and by the "Vulgar, *Nazarens*; who believe "in Chriſt, the Son of God. St. *Epiphanius*, in the Account he gives of this Sect, ſays, *the Nazarens and Cerinthians began at the ſame time*, and that *all Chriſtians were at firſt called Nazarens*. *Epiph. Hæreſ. Naz. c.* 1. What he ſays farther of them, ſhall be alledged in its proper Place: in the mean time, theſe Teſtimonies (which no Man controverts) are ſufficient to ſhow, what was the Cauſe of this Name, and how antient it is; and that the Sect thereby intended, not only indured, but overſpread *the Orient*, at what time St. *Jerom* wrote to St. *Auſtin*, which was about the Year 416. What is meant by *the Orient*, was declared before, when I treated of the Creed.

Ebionites is another Name of the antient Unitarians, and firſt (genuine) Chriſtians; tho not without a Mixture [if their Adverſaries (after having deſtroyed all their Writings and Defences) may be accepted as Witneſſes againſt them] of very bad People among them. It is not certain, whether they have been thus named from one *Ebion*, a particular Man; or from *the poor* and low Opinion they had of our Saviour's Perſon, owning him indeed to be the Chriſt, but *the Son of* Joſeph *and* Mary: Some of the Antients affirm the one, ſome the other of theſe. Nor is the Matter worth diſputing, becauſe they are (by all) granted to have been Contemporaries with the Apoſtles; and that they held the Lord Chriſt was a Man only, the Chriſt, the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary by Generation*, the Son of God

by Holineſs, Adoption and Exaltation.

The Queſtion now, between Dr. *Bull* and us, is, not concerning the *Ebionites*, for he and all others grant, that the Ebionites held concerning our Saviour, that he was a mere Man; but concerning the Nazarens and Mineans; namely, whether the Nazarens and Mineans ſuppoſed, the Lord Chriſt was a Divine Perſon, and God; or only a Man, a Prophet, the true *Meſſias* or Chriſt, the Son of God (not only by Holineſs, Adoption and Exaltation, as the other Ebionites ſaid) but by his miraculous Generation (in the Womb of *Mary*) by the Spirit or Power of God? We affirm the latter of theſe; but not altogether confounding the Mineans and Nazarens, with the Ebionites. For tho they were both of them Jews, or Proſelytes of the Jews, yet there was this Difference between the Ebionites and the Nazarens; that the former believed the Lord Jeſus was the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary* by Nature, the Son of God by Adoption, Exaltation and Holineſs; but the Nazarens ſaid, he was the Son of God alſo by his miraculous Conception, being conceived by the Spirit or Power of God, and born of *Mary*, who had never known any Man. But this alſo is to be noted, that tho the Nazarens held our Saviour's miraculous Conception, by the Spirit of God; and the Ebionites contended, that he was the Son of only *Joſeph* and *Mary*: yet becauſe they both agreed in theſe two main Points, that Jeſus Chriſt was a Man only, and that the Law (by *Moſes*) ought to be obſerved by all Jewiſh Chriſtians (not by the Gentile Chriſtians) together with the Goſpel; therefore the Vulgar, and even thoſe Learned Writers (of the Catholick Party) who conſider'd them only in what they agreed, namely, that the Lord Chriſt is not God, but Man only, called both of them Ebionites; as we ſhall preſently ſee.

Dr. *Bull* is a very litigious Oppoſer; it will therefore be expedient, for the prevention of a great many Eluſions and Subtleties, to take notice in the firſt place, what he grants to us concerning the propoſed Queſtion, *What the Nazarens held concerning our Saviour's Perſon?* What Authorities has he owned; and how far has he yielded this Queſtion: in the yielding of which, he profeſſes, that the Socinians have carried this whole Controverſy concerning the Quality of our Saviour's Perſon? for it can be diſputed no longer, he ſaith, whether our Saviour was a Man only, if the Nazaren Chriſtians were of that Belief.

He grants, that *Origen* aſſures us, "That the Jews who believe in "Chriſt, obſerve the Moſaick Law "together with the Goſpel: and "that *all Jews who own Jeſus to be* "*the Chriſt, are called Ebionites. Orig. contr. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 56. I wiſh, inſtead of his wondring at this Account given by *Origen*, he had been ſo ſincere, as to let the Reader know, that *Origen* having lived long in *Syria*,

ria, nay in *Paleſtine*, which is to ſay, in the very midſt of the Nazaren or Jewiſh Churches, could not but know their true State and Opinions. He ſaith, *all the Jews that are Chriſtians, are called Ebionites:* and does not he (and with him, all the Antients) every where tell us, that the Ebionites were all of them Unitarians; nay were called Ebionites, from their *poor* and low Opinion of our Saviour, that he was a Man only, not God? Let Dr. *Bull* produce any of the Fathers, who have ever named the Ebionites, who do not alſo (explicitly) confeſs, that they believed our Saviour to be a Man only. In ſhort, the Nazarens are granted by all (and by Dr. *Bull* in particular) to be thoſe Chriſtian Jews, that were gathered into Churches in *Jeruſalem* and *Paleſtine*, by the Miniſtry of the Apoſtles themſelves: *Origen* (who lived among them) witneſſes, that all Jews who were Chriſtians, were named *Ebionites* or *the poor ones*, partly from the *poor Opinion* they had of our Saviour's Perſon, partly becauſe they adhered ſtill to the *beggarly Principles* and Rites of the Moſaick Law: it unavoidably follows, that the Nazarens were Ebionites in this Senſe; that they held the Lord Chriſt was a Man only, and obſerved the Law together with the Goſpel. I ſaid, Ebionites *in this Senſe*; becauſe, as was noted before, the Ebionites, more *ſtrictly ſo called*, believed our Saviour was the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary:* but the Nazarens, tho they believed he was a Man only, yet they held he was miraculouſly conceived in the Womb of *Mary*, by the ſole Power and Energy of God, without the Concurrence of any Man.

As *Origen* makes no Diſtinction of the Ebionites, into Ebionites and Nazarens; becauſe of their Agreement in the main Points, that *the Lord Chriſt was a Man only*, and that *the Moſaick Law muſt be obſerved by all Jewiſh Chriſtians:* no more does *Euſebius*, who contents himſelf to obſerve, that *ſome Ebionites hold the miraculous Conception*; others of them ſay, *he was the Son of* Joſeph *and* Mary. *Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 27.* But neither he nor *Origen* charge either of them, as *Epiphanius* in after Ages (from no Author) does; that they owned of the Old Teſtament, only the Books of *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, not the Prophets: or that they calumniated St. *Paul*, and rejected his Epiſtles; publiſhing alſo certain *Acts of St.* Paul, wherein they charge him as an Apoſtate from the Law, only becauſe he could not obtain for his Wife a Prieſt's Daughter. *Epiphanius* imputes this, not to the Nazaren-Ebionites, but to thoſe Ebionites who held our Saviour was the Son of only *Joſeph* and *Mary:* but as I ſaid, he quotes no Author; and therefore this ſeems to be one of the malitious Tales which contending Sects and Parties frequently raiſe upon one another. So in after-times, the Albigenſes, Waldenſes, and Wiclevites, were charged with monſtrous Hereſies, which they not only abominated, but are refuted by the Proteſtant

ſtant Hiſtorians, out of the Catechiſms, Sermons, and other Books of thoſe early Reformers. They were charged with teaching, that the Devil is above God; that *Elizabeth* was Chriſt's Concubine, and taken with him in Adultery; with other more horrid and fooliſh things, not fit to be named: but the Proteſtant Hiſtorians have evinced, to the Satisfaction even of all learned and ingenuous Papiſts, out of the Books and Catechiſms of thoſe pious Men; that theſe are diabolical Calumnies, deviſed by their Perſecutors the Friars.

Farther, *Dr.* Bull *grants*, that *Theodoret* (*Hæret. Fab. l.* 2. *c.* 3.) affirms expreſly, that *the Nazarens honour the Lord Chriſt, only as a holy Man*, not as God or a Divine Perſon. Becauſe this Father alſo lived in *Syria*, was a moſt learned and inquiſitive Perſon, and writeth in that Work (before-quoted) of all Hereticks and their Opinions; we may (ſurely) rely on the Account he gives. 'Twas impoſſible that *Theodoret*, whoſe Biſhoprick was *in Syriâ cavâ*, whereabouts the Nazarens and Mineans then moſt abounded; and whoſe very Deſign it was (in that Book which we alledg) to ſet down the peculiar Opinions of all the Diſtinctions and Denominations of Chriſtians: I ſay, 'tis impoſſible he ſhould not certainly know the Doctrine of the Nazarens, the moſt famous as well as moſt antient of all thoſe Denominations which diſſented from *the Church* (or *prevailing Party*) of thoſe Times. And whereas Dr. *Bull* excepts, that *Theodoret* is a later Father than ſome he quotes; 'tis a mere and a wretched Subterfuge. Firſt, becauſe St. *Jerom* (before cited) witneſſes, that *then* the Nazarens flouriſh'd over all the Orient; and *Epiphanius*, that they abounded chiefly in *Paleſtine* and *Syriâ cavâ*. Secondly, becauſe in very Deed *Theodoret* was contemporary with *Sulpitius Severus*, who is (as we ſhall ſee) Dr. *Bull*'s only Author, the only Father who ever miſtook the Nazaren Doctrine concerning our Saviour: and the Occaſion of his Miſtake was, that he lived ſo remote from them; they in the Orient, he in the Weſt, that is to ſay, at about 2000 Miles diſtance. *Sulpitius* began to write (at ſooneſt) about the Year 401. *Theodoret* was made Biſhop in 420. ſo *Theodoret* might be the older Man. But however that be, one lived in *Syria* among the Nazaren Churches; the other in the remoteſt Parts of *Gaul*, diſtant from the Nazarens the whole length of the Roman Empire, when in its greateſt Extent; and therefore 'tis no wonder, if he miſtook the Nazaren Doctrine.

He grants, again; that *Epiphanius* (*Hæreſ.* 30. *c.* 2.) informs us, *Cerinthianis & Nazaræis fuiſſe, ὅμοια τὰ φρονήματα, the Cerinthians and Nazarens had like Sentiments:* and (*Hæreſ.* 30. *c.* 2.) *Nazaræos & Ebionæos capita ſimul contuliſſe, ſuamque nequitiam invicem communicaſſe, i.e.* "The Nazarens "and Ebionites laid Heads together, "and communicated their Impiety

"(by

(by which *Epiphanius*, without doubt, means their *Hereſy*) "one "with another. Laſtly, that *Epiphanius* doubts only of this; whether in this the Nazarens agreed with the Cerinthians, that the Lord Chriſt was *a common and ordinary Man*, or was miraculouſly generated by the Holy Spirit (or Power of God) in the Womb of *Mary*. Let us put this together; *Epiphanius* ſays, the Nazarens and Cerinthians had like Opinions: but did the former believe (as the other did) that the Lord Chriſt was *a common Man*, born (as all other Men are) of a humane Father and Mother; or did they grant, that he was a Man indeed, but *miraculouſly conceived* by the Divine Power, in the Womb of a Virgin? *Epiphanius* profeſſes, that he cannot, upon his own Knowledg, charge the Nazarens with the former of theſe Opinions. Farther, he owns, that the Ebionites and Nazarens were extremely gratious and intimate, and communicated in the ſame Impiety; that is, Hereſy.

Theſe Teſtimonies do ſtagger Dr. *Bull*, ſo that at laſt (*Judic. Eccl. p.* 56, 57.) he is willing to grant, that at length *ſome Nazarens* were infected with the Ebionite Hereſy, that the Lord Chriſt is a Man only: and of theſe Nazarens (whom he calls *the latter Nazarens*, tho the Antients never make any ſuch Diſtinction, as the former and latter Nazirens) he thinks, *Origen* is to be underſtood, when he ſays, as was before quoted, that *the Jewiſh Chriſtians* (*i. e.* the Nazarens) *are Ebionites*. There never was a more injudicious Paragraph, unleſs the Man wilfully prevaricates. For firſt, why doth he ſay, *ſome Nazarens* were infected with the Ebionite Hereſy, when *Origen* (who is his Author) expreſly ſays, *all the Jewiſh Chriſtians are Ebionites?* Εβιωναῖοι χρηματίζουσιν, ſays *Origen*, οἱ ἀπὸ Ιουδαίων τὸν Ιησοῦν ὡς χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι; i. e. *the Jews, that own Jeſus to be the Chriſt, are Ebionites. Contr. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.*56. Secondly, I deſire to know of Dr. *Bull*, how *Epiphanius* could more effectually declare the Doctrine of the Nazarens concerning the Quality of our Saviour's Perſon, than by ſaying, *they hold as the Cerinthians do*; and they *mutually communicate their Hereſy with the Ebionites*. For was it ever made a Queſtion, or dares he queſtion it, that the Cerinthians and Ebionites held, the Lord Chriſt was a Man only? 'Tis a ridiculous Subterfuge, when he pretends, the Nazarens might at firſt hold the Divinity of our Saviour, but afterwards (ſomewhat before *Origen*'s time) fell off to the Cerinthian and Ebionite Doctrine. For I requeſt him, to produce but the leaſt Intimation from any Father or Hiſtorian, that the Nazarens changed their Opinion, by falling off from the Trinitarians to the Unitarians, as he pretends they did: 'tis a mere ſhift, to which he was forced, by the Clearneſs of the Teſtimonies given by *Origen* and *Epiphanius*.

But I ſhall mind him of other Evidences, that the Nazarens were Unitarians; or held but one Divine Perſon, and that our Saviour was a Man only. *Epiphanius* (*Hæreſ. Naz. c.* 7.) ſays; *Nazaræi à Judæis nullâ in re diſſentiunt, niſi quod in Chriſtum credunt: i. e.* "The Jews and Nazarens differ in nothing, ſaving that "the latter believe in Chriſt. But if the Nazaren Chriſtians had held *more than one Divine Perſon*, or that *the Meſſias or Chriſt was to be God*; they had differed from the Jews, in two the higheſt Points of all: for all Men know and own, that the Jews believed but one Divine Perſon; and Dr. *Bull* himſelf has largely proved, (out of *Juſtin Martyr*) that the Jews expected, that the Meſſias (or Chriſt) ſhould be a Man only, not God. To the Teſtimony of *Juſtin*, he might have added *Origen contr. Celſ. l.* 2. *p.* 79. & *l.* 4. *p.* 162.

Farthermore, when *Epiphanius* (in the Chapter before-quoted) makes doubt, whether the Nazarens held that the Lord Chriſt was *the Son of* Joſeph *and* Mary, or was miraculouſly *generated by the Holy Spirit in the Womb of* Mary: who ſees not, that he took it for granted and certain, that they denied he was God or a Divine Perſon; if he had not firſt ſuppoſed *that*, he could never have made it a Queſtion, whether they did not think he was the Son of only *Joſeph* and *Mary?* Becauſe he knew, that the Nazarens believed the Lord Chriſt was only a Man; therefore he queſtions, and otherwiſe could not queſtion; whether they held, he was the Son of *Mary* by *Joſeph*, or of *Mary* by the Holy Spirit?

To add now no more, St. *Auſtin* (*contr. Creſc. l.* 1. *c.* 31.) ſays; *Et nunc ſunt quidam Hæretici, qui ſe Nazaræos vocant; à nonnullis tamen Symmachiani appellantur*, i. e. "There "are now certain Heretieks, by "themſelves called Nazarens; but "by divers they are named Symmachians. To know therefore what the Nazarens held, we need only to inquire, what *Symmachus* held. *Euſebius* will anſwer; *Symmachus* was an Ebionite, and maintained Chriſt to be the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*. *Euſeb. H. E. l.* 6. *c.* 17. But here we are to note two things. Firſt, the Nazarens did not hold, that the Lord Chriſt was the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*; but the Son of God, by miraculous Conception in the Virgin *Mary*. But *divers* (as St. *Auſtin* has cautiouſly worded it) were not ſo critical, or ſo well verſed in the Knowledg of Sects, as to mind or underſtand the ſeveral Subdiviſions of them: therefore becauſe the Nazarens were ſo far Ebionites and Symmachians, that they held the Lord Chriſt was *a Man only*, tho generated not by *Joſeph* but by the Power of God in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*; they called them Ebionites and Symmachians, tho both theſe (the Symmachians and Ebionites) not only believed that Chriſt was *but a Man*, but that he was the Son of *Joſeph* by *his Wife* Mary, not of God *by the Virgin* Mary. Secondly, *Symmachus* and

and the Ebionites, as they held our Saviour to be the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*; ſo they contended, that the firſt Chapter of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was added by the Greek Tranſlator. St. *Matthew* wrote his Goſpel in Hebrew; when it was tranſlated into Greek, the Tranſlator prefaced it with a Genealogy, and a Narration that our Saviour was conceived by the Holy Spirit of God, and was not the Son of *Joſeph*: but this Genealogy and Narration, ſaid *Symmachus* and the Ebionites, is not in the Hebrew Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, nay is the mere Invention of the Tranſlator. As for the other Goſpels, the Ebionites and *Symmachus* did not receive the Goſpel of St. *Luke*: and for that of St. *John*, they ſaid it was indeed written by *Cerinthus*, to confirm his (Platonick) Conceits about the *Logos* or *WORD*; which he ſuppoſed to be *the Chriſt*, or Spirit of God that reſted on, and inhabited the Perſon of *Jeſus*.

Let us now, for the Eaſe of the Reader, ſum up this whole Evidence concerning the Nazarens, in ſhort Paragraphs. All grant, they were the Jewiſh Chriſtians, whoſe firſt Churches were gathered by the Apoſtles themſelves in *Judea*, *Jeruſalem*, *Paleſtine*, *Syria*, *Arabia*, and the whole Orient. The Queſtion is, what they held concerning Almighty God, and the Perſon of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: whether they ſaid, there is but one Divine Perſon, and our Saviour is a Man only; or whether they held a Trinity of Divine Perſons, and that our Saviour is God moſt High? We affirm the former of theſe, Dr. *Bull* the latter. We alledg that,

Theodoret ſays, in expreſs Terms; the Nazarens honour the Lord Chriſt, not as God, but *only as a holy Man*. We obſerve, that *Theodoret* lived where (*Epiphanius* informs us) the Nazaren Churches then moſt abounded, *in Syriâ cavâ*: and that in the Work by us quoted, it is the very Deſign of *Theodoret*, to tell us the particular Opinions of the ſeveral Denominations and Sects of Chriſtians.

We alledg again, that the moſt learned *Origen*, who alſo lived a long time in *Syria* and *Paleſtine* it ſelf, ſays; that all Jewiſh Chriſtians were Ebionites. And *Euſebius*, that all Ebionites hold the Lord Chriſt is a Man only; but they are divided (ſays he) into two Sects: for the Symmachians and ſuch like Ebionites believe, Chriſt is *a Man, the Son of* Joſeph *and* Mary; others of them ſay, he is *a Man (miraculouſly) generated by the Holy Spirit*, or Divine Power, in the Womb of a Virgin.

St. *Auſtin* ſays, the Nazarens are Symmachians. But he means only, they are *thus far* Symmachians, that they think Chriſt is only a Man, not God.

Epiphanius ſays, *the Nazarens communicated in their Hereſy with the Ebionites*; and that they *held as the Cerinthians do*: both which believed, that our Saviour was a mere Man. He ſays, *they agreed in all Points with the Jews*; concerning whom, 'tis certain and granted; that

that they never believed more than one Divine Perſon; and Dr. *Bull* himſelf has proved, that they expected the Meſſias (or Chriſt) ſhould be a Man, not God. Again, *Epiphanius* makes it appear, that he took it for yielded, that the Nazarens believed the Lord Chriſt to be a Man only; in that he doubts, whether they did not alſo hold, that he is *the Son of only* Joſeph *and* Mary.

To Dr. Bull's *Objections concerning the Nazarens.*

AS to what Dr. *Bull* objects, I ſhall now evince, how frivolous and impertinent it is. He objects firſt, the Authority of *Sulpitius Severus*, who began to write about the Year 401. *Sulpitius* ſays, "The "Emperor *Adrian* drove *all Jews* "out of *Jeruſalem:* but this tended "to the Advantage of the Chriſtian "Religion; for at that time *almoſt* "*all* of them believed *in Chriſt God. Hiſt. ſacr. l.* 2. *c.* 31. This Expulſion of all Jews from *Jeruſalem*, hapned about the Year of Chriſt 135. The Words *almoſt all* are intended to ſignify, that as the Jews were the Majority of the Inhabitants and Citizens of *Jeruſalem*; ſo the moſt (the far greater Number) of them were Chriſtians. But when he adds, they believed *in Chriſt-God*; I have proved it to be a Miſtake, by the Teſtimony of thoſe Fathers who lived among the Jewiſh Chriſtians, namely, *Origen* and *Theodoret*; and of other Fathers who were much nearer to them than *Sulpitius*, even *Epiphanius* and St. *Auguſtin. Epiphanius* was Biſhop of *Conſtantia* in *Cyprus*, an Iſland juſt by *Paleſtine*; and he himſelf was a Native, and had his Education in *Paleſtine:* St. *Auſtin*, from *Hippo* in *Africa*, informed himſelf of the State of the Syrian and Paleſtine Churches, not only by Letters *to* and *from* the Learned Men of thoſe Churches and Provinces; but alſo by ſome of his Clergy, whom he maintained at *Jeruſalem* and the Holy Land, only for Intelligence and Information. On the contrary, *Sulpitius* lived in *Aquitain*, a Province of *Gaul*, in the (remoteſt) weſtern Parts of the Roman Empire; at the Diſtance of above 2000 Miles from *Paleſtine* and *Syria*, where the Jewiſh Chriſtians had their Churches; or as their Enemies (particularly St. *Jerom*) ſpoke, their *Synagogues.* We cannot much wonder, that at ſo great a Diſtance from the Jewiſh Chriſtians, *Sulpitius* miſtook their Doctrine, concerning the Quality of our Saviour's Perſon, or whether he were God or Man: nor will any Man of Prudence think, that one *Sulpitius*, at ſuch a Remotion from them, is to be believed, againſt ſo many moſt learned Fathers, who dwelt partly among the Nazarens, partly very near

near to them. Beſides, *Sulpitius* was not a Divine, but a Lawyer; bred a Heathen, and went over to the Chriſtian Religion after he had long practiſed (as they ſpeak) at the Bar: 'tis eaſily conceived, that a New Convert to Chriſtianity, might not be very skilful in the Knowledg and Diſtinction of Sects. Therefore Monſieur *du Pin* obſerves concerning *Sulpitius*, "That tho his Abridgment of "the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is the beſt "we have of the Antients, yet it is "not very exact: He commits di-"vers Faults againſt the Truth of "Hiſtory, eſpecially the Eccleſiaſti-"cal. *Eccl. Hiſt. cent.* 5. *p.* 112.

Dr. *Bull* cites alſo *Euſeb. Hiſt. l.* 4. *c.* 5. where that Hiſtorian ſays; that the firſt 15 Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* ſat but a very ſhort time; but that he finds in the Writings of the Antients, that *thoſe Biſhops received and profeſſed the true Knowledg of Chriſt.* I believe, there is no learned Man will doubt, that *Euſebius* his Author for *this*, was *Hegeſippus*; who was the firſt that wrote an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which he publiſhed about the Year of Chriſt 170, a Work now loſt, to the great Regret of learned Men. But when *Hegeſippus* ſays, the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* profeſſed *the true Knowledg of Chriſt*, did he mean, as Dr. *Bull* ſuppoſes, that Chriſt is God moſt High? No, he meant, that they profeſſed (in oppoſition to the *Doceta* and others, who held the Pre-exiſtence of our Saviour, and that he was not a Man) *he was a true and very Man, and a Man only:* Of this I am perſwaded by theſe Conſiderations.

Firſt, *Hegeſippus* was himſelf a Jewiſh Chriſtian, as *Euſebius* (*Hiſt. l.* 4. *c.* 22.) witneſſes: but all Jewiſh Chriſtians, ſaith *Origen*, (who lived and flouriſh'd above 100 Years before *Euſebius*) were Ebionites, that is, denied the Divinity of Chriſt.

Secondly, The ſame *Euſebius* (*ibid.*) ſays, that *Hegeſippus made uſe of St.* Matthew's *Hebrew Goſpel*; which was uſed only by the Ebionites, and Unitarian Chriſtians.

Thirdly, When *Hegeſippus* (*apud Euſeb. ibid.*) reckons up the Hereſies and Hereticks of the Jewiſh Nation, that were (ſaith he) againſt the Tribe of *Judah*, and againſt Chriſt; he names the Samaritans, Phariſees, Sadduces, Eſſeans, Masbotheans, Galileans, Hemerobaptiſts: but if the Denial of our Saviour's Divinity had been a Jewiſh Hereſy, if the Ebionites or Cerinthians had been Hereticks, in the Judgment of *Hegeſippus*, they muſt have come into the Catalogue of *Hereticks that were againſt Chriſt*, for 'tis certain (and yielded on all hands) that both theſe Sects denied the Divinity of our Saviour. If it be ſaid, *Hegeſippus* might not reckon the Ebionites and Cerinthians among the Jewiſh Hereticks; becauſe tho they were Jews by Nation, they were Chriſtians by Religion: yet at leaſt he would have put them into the Liſt of Chriſtian Hereticks, which he does not. The Chriſtian Hereſies, according to *Hegeſippus*, are the Hereſy of the Simonians, Menandrians, Marcionites,

cionites, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Basilidians, Saturninians; but not a word of the Ebionite, Cerinthian, Alogian, or Monarchian Hereticks, who were all Unitarians. But the Reader must here take care, that he is not imposed on by *Valesius* his Translation of *Eusebius*: for the Translation, after the Enumeration of the before-named Heresies and Hereticks, adds (*aliisq;*) *and others*, as if some were omitted; but the Greek Text of *Eusebius* has no such Words. In short, I say, *Hegesippus* gives a Catalogue of the Heresies of the Jews and Gentiles, but does not account either the Cerinthians or Ebionites among the Hereticks; which he certainly would, if he himself had held the Pre-existence and Divinity of our Saviour.

Lastly, I have before cited *Valesius*, owning and professing, that the Ecclesiastical History of *Hegesippus* was lost by the Antients: because (like the Hypotyposes of St. *Clemens*) it was observed to agree with the Unitarians. If it be said, But did not *Eusebius* know *this*; and yet he always speaks respectfully of *Hegesippus*: I answer, without doubt he knew it; but durst not take notice of it: it was not for *Eusebius*, to find fault with an Apostolical Father; he could only dissemble his Knowledg of what the Unitarians (and particularly his Antagonist *Marcellus*) would not fail to make Advantage; and this also is the Reason, as I hinted before, why this crafty Arian will take no notice of the Apostolick Creed, *as composed by them*, tho he *recites paraphrastically* (that so he may impose on his Reader) the Heads of it. *Hist. l. 1. c. 13.*

But if *Hegesippus* (Unitarian *Hegesippus*) was the Author whom *Eusebius* follows, in the Account he gives of the first 15 Bishops of *Jerusalem*, that *they professed the true Knowledg of Christ*; which will not be questioned by any that are conversant in *Eusebius*, or have observed that he professes (*Hist. l. 4. c. 8, & 22.*) to follow *Hegesippus* concerning the Apostolick and following times: we have also gained another very great Point; namely, this. That not only the Jewish Christians, but those of *Rome* and all the great Churches to which *Hegesippus* had resorted, to know their Doctrine and Discipline, were also Unitarians; that is, held (with *Hegesippus*) that the Lord Christ is a Man only. For he saith (*apud Euseb. l. 4. c. 22.*) "That he "travelled to *Rome*, where he lived "under the Popes *Anicetus*, *Soter* "and *Eleutherus*, successively Popes "of *Rome*; but both here, and in "all other Episcopates, they keep "the Doctrines taught by the Law "and the Prophets, and by our Sa-"viour. Briefly, he owns, that he found the Churches every where to be Orthodox and uniform: of which, if he was an Unitarian, as (I think) I have proved, the Meaning can be only this; that they believed, as the Jewish Christians do, *the Lord Christ is a Man, the Prophet and Messenger of God, on whom the* Logos *or Divine*

vine WORD reſted. This perfectly agrees with the Account that the old Unitarians (in *Euſebius*) give; namely, that *they had kept the Doctrine deliver'd by the Apoſtles, and which was profeſſed every where, till the Oppoſition made to it, by the Popes* Victor *and* Zepherin, who ſucceeded to *Eleutherus*, as he to *Soter*, and *Soter* to *Anicetus*, with which Orthodox Popes *Hegeſippus* had converſed. The ſhort is; We grant that *Euſebius* ſays, the *Jeruſalem*-Biſhops *profeſſed the true Knowledg of Chriſt:* We anſwer, he borrowed this from *Hegeſippus*, whom he took for his Author, eſpecially in what concerned the Apoſtolick Times, and the Times that followed, to the taking of *Jeruſalem* by the Emperor *Adrian* in the Year 135, that is, while the 15 Biſhops (concerning whom our preſent Queſtion and Debate is) governed the Churches of *Jeruſalem* and *Judea*. But *Hegeſippus* being himſelf a Jewiſh Chriſtian, that is, one that believed our Saviour to be a Man only, when he ſaid, the *Jeruſalem*-Biſhops profeſſed *the true Knowledg of Chriſt*, he undoubtedly meant, that our Lord was a true and mere Man; againſt the *Docetæ* and other platonizing Chriſtians, who held his Pre-exiſtence, and denied that he was a Man.

Dr. *Bull* is not aſhamed to infer, from St. *Auſtin*'s Saying, that *the Nazarens confeſs Chriſt is the Son of God*; that they held he is ſo the Son of God, that *he was born of God from all Eternity.* I ſay, he is *not aſhamed* of this Inference, tho he knows that all Ebionites believed Chriſt was a Man only; and yet *Epiphanius* ſays of them, divers times, as St. *Auſtin* does of the Nazarens, that *they own the Lord Chriſt is the Son of God.* For tho the Ebionites did not believe the miraculous Conception, yet they ſaid the Lord Chriſt is the Son of God, *progreſſione Virtutis, & quatenus ad ſublimia cœleſtiaq; provectus eſt*, *i. e.* by Holineſs, and by his Exaltation to the right Hand of God, *Epiphan. Hæreſ. Ebion. c.* 13. *Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 30. But let us recite the very Words of St. *Auſtin*, *de Hæreſ. c.* 9, 10. " The *Nazarens*, as they " confeſs Chriſt is the Son of God, " ſo they obſerve the whole Law; " the which, Chriſtians have been " taught that 'tis to be underſtood " and taken ſpiritually, not carnally. " The Ebionites *alſo* ſay, that Chriſt " is a Man only, and obſerve the car- " nal Precepts of the Law. Theſe Words, *the Ebionites alſo ſay, that Chriſt is a Man only*, would be Nonſenſe; if the Nazarens, of whom he ſpeaks *immediately before*, had not likewiſe ſo held.

In like manner he would put a falſe Meaning on theſe Words of St. *Jerom*; " The Nazarens believe in " Chriſt the Son of God, who was " born of the Virgin *Mary*: the " ſame, ſay they, who ſuffered under " *Pontius Pilate*, and roſe again " from the Dead; in whom alſo " *WE* (*i. e. we of the Church*) be- " lieve. One would have thought, that when the Nazarens ſay here;

We believe in the Son of God *that was born of the Virgin* Mary, *was put to Death under* Pontius Pilate, *and roſe again from the Dead:* they had ſufficiently declared, that the Son of God in whom they believed was *the Man* Chriſt Jeſus; not a Son of God that could not be born of the Virgin *Mary*, or die, or riſe again. But becauſe St. *Jerom* ſays, *in whom alſo we believe*; Dr. *Bull* cries out, Look here, the Nazarens believed in that Son of God, in whom the Orthodox believed. *We* think ſo too, Doctor; becauſe both Parties believed in the Son of God, *who was generated and born of* Mary, *died, and roſe again:* tho the Orthodox (ſo called) invented alſo another Son of God; a Son that could not be generated and born of *Mary*, a Son that could not die, a Son *as old as his Father*, a ſecond Almighty, another Creator, firſt made known by the Council of *Nice*.

Next, Dr. *Bull* produces a Paſſage out of *Juſtin Martyr*, to prove that there were ſome Chriſtians who obſerved the Moſaick Law, and yet believed in ſuch a Chriſt, *who was before* Lucifer *and the Moon:* and who could theſe be, but the Nazarens? I anſwer; whoever they were, they were not the Nazarens: moſt of the Gnoſtick Sects, who alſo obſerved the Moſaick Law, held the Pre-exiſtence of our Saviour. What hinders, but that they might be the Cerinthians? Beſides, it is uncertain, whether *Juſtin* meant to ſay, that there were ſome Chriſtians who keep the Law of *Moſes*, and yet believe that Chriſt was *before* Lucifer *and the Moon:* to make out this Senſe, Dr. *Bull* is forced to add theſe Words to the Words of *Juſtin*, *ſuch a Chriſt as you before deſcribed. Judic. Eccl. p.* 52. which Addition ſeems alſo contrary to the Context, where 'tis inſerted by Dr. *Bull*; for Dr. *Bull* contends for a Chriſt (in that Context) who was *before* Lucifer *and the Moon*; and the Context deſcribes *a Chriſt that was crucified, and to whom GOD has committed the Judgment of the Dead and Living, and has given to him a Kingdom that ſhall have no end.* This ſeems to be a mere Ebionite or Socinian-Chriſt; a Man, not God.

Laſtly, he quotes the Title of the 12*th* Chapter of the 6*th* Book of *the Conſtitutions* of St. *Clement*, that is, as Dr. *Bull* himſelf confeſſes, falſly intitled to St. *Clement*. The Words are theſe, *Of thoſe who confeſs, but yet live after the manner of the Jews:* Dr. *Bull* would have it thought, that this Title ſpeaks of thoſe *who confeſs that Chriſt is the moſt High and Eternal God.* Theſe, Mr. *Bull* thinks, could be no other but the Nazarens. But to come at that Concluſion, Mr. *Bull* muſt firſt prove; not only that the Nazarens believed the Lord Chriſt is *God the WORD:* but that there were no other Denominations of Chriſtians, who obſerved the Moſaick Law, and alſo believed that Chriſt is *God the WORD*. But he knows, that the Cerinthians, and moſt of the Gnoſtick Sects, did Judaize and alſo believe the Pre-exiſtence

iſtence of our Saviour, and that he is *God the WORD.* But let us grant to Dr. *Bull* whatever he contends for, from this Citation; and ſee how it will advantage his main Cauſe. The Queſtion is concerning the Nazarens, whether they held, as the Church now does, that there is more than one *Divine* and *Eternal* Perſon; are there two, or three ſuch Perſons, is the Lord Chriſt *the eternal God?* Yes, ſays Dr. *Bull*; for *the Conſtitutions* (chap. 11.) have a Confeſſion to that purpoſe; and the 12*th* Chapter is *concerning thoſe that confeſs* (that is, ſo confeſs) *and yet live after the manner of the Jews*, that is, obſerve the Moſaick Law: and theſe, moſt certainly, were the Nazarens. But if the Nazarens *confeſſed* in the *Form* there mentioned; they were far from believing as Dr. *Bull*, and the Church, now believe. Let us hear the Confeſſion at *chap.* 11. to which the Title urged by Dr. *Bull* does refer. It ſaith, "We teach but "one God, the Father of Chriſt; "not a ſecond, not a third, not a "manifold God; but one eternal "God. One would think, this were *Socinus*, or *J. Crellius de uno Deo Patre:* but towards the Concluſion, the Author (or Authors) ſhow, that he held the ſame Doctrine with *Arius*; for tho he had ſaid, there is but one God *who is Eternal* or from Eternity, yet he owns that Chriſt is *not a mere Man*, but is alſo *God the WORD.* That is, there is but one *true*, one *eternal* God, yet the Son or WORD is alſo God in an inferiour Senſe: namely, a God that was generated in time, and is ſet over the Works of the Creation. Monſieur *du Pin* deals ingenuouſly, when he owns, that the Author of *the Conſtitutions* ſeems to have been an Arian: he rightly adds, that *the Conſtitutions, as we now have them*, were forged after the times of St. *Epiphanius*; for that Father quotes them far otherways than, nay contrary to, what they now are. *Eccl. Hiſt. Cent.* 1. *p.* 29, 30.

If the Reader compares this Section, with what I have alledged in the foregoing, he will perceive, that 'tis with the greateſt Juſtice and Truth in the World, that the preſent Unitarians claim the Nazarens (or firſt Jewiſh Churches and Chriſtians) as of our Party.

Of the Alogi, or Alogians, &c.

FRom the Nazarens, that is, the *Jewiſh Chriſtians*, I go on to the *Alogi* or *Alogians*, who were the antient *Gentile Chriſtians.* They were called *Alogian*, or *Alogi*, becauſe they denied the *Logos* or WORD, of which St. *John* ſpeaks in his Goſpel, Epiſtles and Revelation: they ſaid, that all thoſe Pieces were written by *Cerinthus*, under the Name of St. *John*.

John; to confirm *Cerinthus* his Conceits about the *Logos*, and the *Millenium* or thouſand Years Reign of Chriſt here upon Earth. For tho the *Alogi* held, that the Lord Chriſt is a Man only; as alſo did *Cerinthus*; yet *Cerinthus* (of the antient Unitarians) had theſe two things, peculiar to himſelf. 1. That the World was made, not immediately by God; but *by God, by the Miniſtry of his Angels.* 2. That the Lord Chriſt was a Man only, the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*; but *there reſted on him thē Logos or Divine WORD*, which he alſo called *the Chriſt*, by which *Cerinthus* intended the Spirit, Energy or Power of God, that Power by which he created Original Matter, and made the World: but as the Chriſt or WORD deſcended on Jeſus at his Baptiſm, ſo it left him at his Crucifixion. The Alogians believed none of theſe things: they ſaid, they had only received from the Apoſtles; that the Lord Chriſt was the great Prophet promiſed by *Moſes* in the Law, and the Meſſias (or Chriſt) intended in the Prophet *Daniel*, and who (in the Fulneſs of Time) was ſent by God to unite both Jews and Gentiles under one common Inſtitution, or Law of Religion.

Epiphanius is the firſt, who gave to them the Name of *Alogi:* before him, that is before the Year 368, they were ſimply called Chriſtians; without any other Name, that might ſignify them to be a particular Sect. They were thoſe Chriſtians of the Gentiles, who retained the ſincere Apoſtolick Doctrine concerning the Unity of God, and the Perſon of our Saviour, without corrupting it (more or leſs) with Platonick Notions, or Gnoſtick Novelties: they were very antient, co-eval with the Apoſtles; and flouriſhed (as the prevailing Party) in the Period called *the Apoſtolick Succeſſion*, or to about the Year 140. *Epiphanius* all along ſpeaks of them, as the antient Unitarians of the Gentiles: He ſays alſo expreſly, *Theodotus adjunxit ſe Hareſi Alogorum*; Theodotus *joined himſelf to the Sect and Churches of the Alogians. Theodotus* appeared about the Year 190; by joining himſelf to the Alogian Sect, we learn, that before he was of the Number of the (new) Platonick Chriſtians; who held the Pre-exiſtence of our Saviour. *Euſebius* is ſtrangely out, or prevaricates too notoriouſly, when he ſays, *Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 28.* that this *Theodotus* was the firſt, who held that our Saviour was *a mere Man:* for not only the Alogians ſo held, but ſo alſo did both ſorts of Ebionites, and that by Confeſſion of *Euſebius* himſelf elſewhere, particularly *H. Eccl. l. 3. c. 27.* But *Euſebius* takes all Occaſions, tho never ſo fraudulently, to depreſs the Unitarians, whom he had undertaken to confute in the Perſon of *Marcellus*, Biſhop of *Ancyra*. We may take notice too, that the *Excerpta* at the End of *Clemens* of *Alexandria* his Books of *Stromata*, which bear the Title of *the Oriental Doctrine of Theodotus*, were not Particulars of the Doctrine of *Theodotus* the Unitarian;

rian; for the Doctrine of *Theodotus* was diametrically oppoſite to the Contents of thoſe *Excerpta*: but the *Excerpta* are nothing elſe but a Fragment of the Hypotypoſes of St. *Clemens* himſelf; which alſo is obſerved by the learned *Valeſius*, in his firſt Note on *Euſeb. H. E. l. 5. c. 11.* and again on *lib. 6. c. 14.* In few Words; that the Alogi held our Saviour was a Man only, is not queſtioned by any: that they belonged at leaſt to *the Apoſtolick Succeſſion* is proved; becauſe 'tis confeſſed by the Trinitarian Hiſtorians, that the Theodotians (who appeared about the Year 190) joined themſelves to the Alogian Churches; and becauſe *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of them (throughout) as flouriſhing in that Period. We have therefore deſervedly here reckoned them, among the antient and firſt Witneſſes of the true Doctrine. As to the Reaſons which they gave, *and which I affirm not*, againſt the Goſpel, and other Works, which we now account to St. *John*, I have already (briefly) intimated them, in *the Conſiderations* on the 4 Sermons of his Grace the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. It was 400 Years before the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was received as Canonical, any where in the Weſt, and but in few Places of the Orient; and other Books of the New Teſtament, eſpecially St. *John*'s *Revelation*, were not preſently admitted by the Catholick Church: it ought not therefore to ſeem ſtrange, that the modern Unitarians allow of the Goſpel and other Pieces of St. *John*; tho they are aware that many of the Antients, and particularly ſome Unitarians ſuſpected, and (too haſtily) rejected them. As it often happens, that Time detects Frauds and Falſhoods, ſo alſo (not unfrequently) it diſcovers and vindicates oppreſſed Truths.

The laſt Monument or Remain of *the Apoſtolick Succeſſion*, which agrees with the Socinian Doctrine concerning our Saviour, are *the Recognitions*, imputed to *Clemens Romanus*. They ſeem to be falſly reckoned to St. *Clemens*: but they are very antient, publiſhed (probably) in the Beginning of the 2*d* Century, or the ſecond Century being but little advanced; when ſo many other ſpurious Pieces were ſet forth, under the Names of Apoſtles, or of Apoſtolical Men. The Recognitions are quoted (divers times) by *Origen*, who began to flouriſh about the Year 210. But they are much antienter than *Origen*, for in a Fragment of *Bardeſanes* (*apud Euſeb. Prap. Evang. l. 6. c. 10.*) who flouriſhed about the Year 170, there is a Paſſage taken word for word out of the *9th* Book of the Recognitions. Whereas Dr. *Cave* conjectures, that *Bardeſanes* was the Author of the *Recognitions*; his Gueſs is nothing probable, nay a manifeſt Miſtake; becauſe the Author of the *Recognitions* was an Ebionite; but *Bardeſanes* a Valentinian, that is, held the Pre-exiſtence of our Saviour, and that he was not (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *made of a Woman*, but brought his Fleſh from Heaven. It

re-

remains therefore, that the *Recognitions* are antienter, not only than *Origen*, but than *Bardesanes*: how much antienter we cannot determinately say; but probably published when the 2*d* Century was but little advanced, when so many affected to countenance their own Productions, with the authoritative Names of the Apostles and Apostolical Men. But tho the *Recognitions* are not the Work of *Clemens Romanus*, yet they serve to let us know, what Doctrines and Rites were current or in use in those times: and to this purpose they are quoted by the severest Criticks, of all Parties and Persuasions. I shall not need to cite particular Passages out of these Books: for 'tis confessed by the Trinitarian Critticks, and by Monsieur *du Pin*, who hath written last on the Fathers, that the Author of the Recognitions was a manifest Ebionite. *Eccl. Hist. cent.* 1. *p.* 28.

But hitherto of *the Apostolick Fathers*, and the Writings and Remains of *the Apostolick Succession*. I have proved, I think, that hitherto we have no certain or probable notice, that there were yet any who publickly professed to hold the Pre-existence of our Saviour; or that he was *God*, in any Sense of that Word. But on the contrary, the Apostles Creed, the true (and by all confessed) St. *Clemens Romanus*, the Nazaren, Minean or Ebionite (that is, the Jewish) Churches, the Alogians (or Gentile Churches) *Hegesippus* the Father of Ecclesiastical History, the most antient Author of the *Recognitions*, were all of them Unitarians; that is, held there is but one Divine Person, and the Lord Christ was a Man only.

It should seem then, that very thing hapned to the Christian Church, which had formerly come to pass in the Church of the Jews. For as the Author of the Book of *Judges* (Judg. 2. 7.) says; "The People of *Israel* "served the Lord, all the Days of "*Joshua*, and of *the Elders* that "outlived *Joshua*; —but when all "that Generation was gathered to "their Fathers, there arose another "after them, which knew not the "Lord: so the Children of *Israel* "did Evil in the sight of the Lord, "and served *Baalim*, i. e. *the Gods*. In like manner, while the Apostles lived, and those *Elders* who had conversed with the Apostles, the Christian Church kept her self to the Acknowledgment and Worship of the one true God; and preserved the true Doctrine and Faith concerning the Person of the Lord Christ, that he was a holy Man, the great Prophet and Messias, promised in the Law and other Books of the Old Testament. But when the Apostles themselves, and the Elders of the Apostolick Succession, were gathered to their Fathers, then began Corruptions to prevail apace: then they fancied a pre-existent Son of God, God's Minister and Instrument in the creating of all things, and but little less than his Father. *A Son*, said they, who being (tho but *the instrumental*, yet) *the immediate* Creator of all things, is to be worshipped by

us

us his Creatures. *A Son*, who, tho with reſpect to the ὄντως Θεὸς (as they ſtill ſpoke) *the true and very God* the Father, is but a Miniſter and Subject; yet with reſpect to us (his Creatures) is a God. *A Son*, who muſt be called Θεὸς, *a God:* tho only the Father may be called ὁ Θεὸς, *the God*; that is, God *by way of Excellence* and true Propriety. In a word, after the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolical Elders or Paſtors, were compoſed to reſt, the next Generation, like the Jewiſh Church, *did Evil in the Sight of the Lord, and ſerved Baalim:* that is, the half-Gods of their own deviſing. *Nemo repente fit turpiſſimus*, therefore here they ſtop a conſiderable time; namely, from about the Year 140 and 150, to the Nicene Council, or the Year 325. at what time, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, Superſtition and Impiety made a ſudden and wonderful Advance.

The firſt Defender and publick Patron of the Apoſtacy, mentioned in the foregoing Paragraph, was *Juſtin Martyr*, about the Year 150. Our Oppoſers can quote no Father (or genuine Monument) older than *Juſtin Martyr*, for the Pre-exiſtence of our Saviour; or that he ought to be called a God, in ſo much as the reſtrained inferiour Senſe, before ſaid. Dr. *Bull* indeed pretends to prove the contrary, from (the counterfeit) *Barnabas*, the falſe *Ignatius*, alias *Pionius*, and the Impoſtor *Hermas:* how injudiciouſly, I think, hath been competently ſhown in theſe preſent Papers; but I will yet oppoſe to him one Authority, which (I doubt not) will convince the indifferent unprejudiced Reader.

Euſebius, that capital Antagoniſt of the Nazaren and Alogian Chriſtians; and who ſearched with the utmoſt Diligence, into the remoteſt Antiquity, for whatſoever might ſeem to make againſt them, quotes (*H. E. l. 5. c. 28.*) a very antient Author, whom (in his foregoing Chapter) he reckons among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers that *deſerve* (ſaith he) *to be eſteemed for their laudable Zeal and Induſtry.* This laudable Man, you muſt know, wrote a Book againſt the Theodotians and Artemonites, who were Branches of the Alogians: what *Euſebius* there cites out of him, is as follows: "The Unitarians "pretend, that *the Apoſtles* and all "*the Antients* held the very Do"ctrine, concerning the Perſon of "our Saviour, that is now main"tained by the Unitarians: and that "it is but only ſince the Times of "the Popes *Victor* and *Zepherin*, "that the Truth has been adultera"ted and diſcountenanced. This "would be credible, if (firſt) the "Unitarian Doctrine were not con"trary to Holy Scripture; and if "divers before *Victor* and *Zepherin* "had not contended for the Divi"nity of the Lord Chriſt, namely, "*Juſtin Martyr*, *Miltiades*, *Tatia"nus*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Ire"neus*, *Melito*. To whom we may "add the antient Hymns or Pſalms, "*wrote from the beginning by the "Brethren*; which ſpeak of Chriſt,

" as *the WORD of God*, and attri-
" bute to him *Divinity*. I will omit now, that all these, but only *Justin*, were *but Contemporaries* to *Victor* and *Zepherin*; or after them: for it is home to my purpose, that *the first* whom our Opposers (of those early times) could quote, was *Justin Martyr*, who saith himself, in his first Apology, that he presented his Apology in the Year 150. The Epistles of *Barnabas* and *Ignatius*, and the Prophecies and Visions of *Hermas*, were not (it should seem) yet come out of the Mint; or were so well known to be Impostures, that no Body durst to alledg them, in these Controversies. The Question between Dr. *Bull* and the present Unitarians is, concerning the Fathers and Monuments of *the Apostolick Succession*: whether these held our Saviour's Pre-existence and Divinity? *Eusebius* answers us, out of *a laudable Author*; that *Justin Martyr* opposed our Doctrine, that is, he giveth up to us the whole *Apostolick Succession*; which is as much as the Socinians ever claimed. As to the Hymns or Psalms of *the Brethren*, which (he saith) spoke of Christ as the WORD of God, and attributed to him Divinity; 'tis plain, that he spoke rashly and at adventures, when he added, *they were composed by the Brethren from the very first*: for seeing *the Authors* of them were unknown; so also of necessity must *their Date*. I doubt not, these are *the Psalms in Honour of Christ*, which were put down in the Patriarchal Church of *Antioch*, under this Censure, that in very deed they were *novel Compositions*, *by later Men, and containing some dangerous Strains*. As we learn from a Letter of the Council at *Antioch*, *apud Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 30.*

Having said what was necessary, concerning *the Apostolick Fathers*, I might now proceed immediately to *the Primitive Fathers*, so called, to distinguish them from the Fathers that lived after the Nicene Council, or the Year 325, who are simply called *Fathers*. But because I would have nothing else to do, in the 2*d* and 3*d* Parts of this Answer to Dr. *Bull*, but only to examine and discuss his (impertinent and most fraudulent) Citations out of the Fathers; and to oppose to them (the certain and clear) Testimonies of the same (and other) Fathers: therefore here I will consider the two Passages in Dr. *Bull*'s *Defence of the Nicene Council*, which (in my opinion) are the only Parts of his Book that needed to be at all remarked on by the Socinians. The first is, concerning *the Grounds* on which *Justin Martyr* and the following Fathers built their new Doctrine of our Saviour's Pre-existence; and that he was (tho a *Ministerial and Subordinate*, yet) an Agent in the Creation of all things. The other is; whether the Explication of the Trinity (or how *three* Divine co-eternal co-equal *Persons* and *Spirits*, can be but *one* God) given by Dr. *Bull*, as out of the Fathers, be not an undeniable unavoidable Tritheism?

Of

Of the Grounds on which Juſtin Martyr, *and the following Fathers, built their Doctrine of our Saviour's Pre-exiſtence; and that he is a (Miniſterial) Creator.*

AFter Dr. *Bull* had quoted ſome Paſſages of the Fathers, wherein they ſay, it was the Divine WORD who appeared ſo often to the Patriarchs, as to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *Jacob*, *Moſes*: He takes notice alſo that ſome learned Men of the Moderns (at *p.* 20. he calls them *viri quidam doctiſſimi*) deride theſe Citations, as mere Dreams of the good Fathers; and hold it for a certain Truth, that it was only an Angel who appeared ſo often, and on ſo many Occaſions, to the Patriarchs: but the Angel, ſay they, is called Jehovah and God, *becauſe on thoſe Occaſions he repreſented the Perſon and Authority of God.* He notes again, that others may object hereupon; if the Fathers were miſtaken in the Ground on which they did build their Suppoſition of our Saviour's Pre-exiſtence, 'tis but too probable, that they have erred alſo in the Suppoſition it ſelf, namely, that the Lord Chriſt did pre-exiſt, or had a Being before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*. He anſwers to the ſeveral Arguments of the *viri quidam doctiſſimi*; and I intend here to examine his Anſwers.

1. They argue; that indeed it is ſaid (at *Exod.* 3. 4.) *God called to* Moſes *out of the midſt of the Buſh*: but it is owned in the (preceding) 2*d* Verſe, that it was indeed *an Angel of the Lord that appeared to* Moſes, *in a Flame of Fire, in the midſt of the Buſh*; and St. *Stephen* alſo aſſures us, (*Acts* 7. 30.) *There appeared to* Moſes *an Angel of the Lord, in a Flame of Fire, in the midſt of a Buſh.* Dr. *Bull* replies; 1*ſt*. The Divine WORD, who is the true God, might be called here an Angel; becauſe he appeared in ſuch manner as Angels were wont to appear. 2*dly*. Some of the Fathers ſaid, that it was an Angel that appeared in the Buſh; but the Divine WORD was *in* the Angel; and it was God *in* the Angel, that ſpoke to *Moſes* theſe Words, *I am the God of thy Fathers.* 3*dly*. 'Tis an abſurd, nay horrible Opinion, to think or maintain, that the Angels ever (as it were) *acted the Perſon, and part of God*, by aſſuming his incommunicable Name *Jehovah*, or his Perſon, Authority and Attributes. He ſaith, it was never heard of, that an Ambaſſador (in delivering the Meſſage or Commands of his Maſter) took on him the Perſon and Stile of his Maſter; but all Ambaſſadors ſay only, *thus ſaith my Maſter.*

Now in anſwer to theſe Eluſions; firſt, Mr. *Bull* has but imperfectly reported the Argument of thoſe learned Men, to whom he endeavours to anſwer. For they not only alledg, that the Perſon who is called *Jehovah* at *Exod.* 3. 4. is declared at *ver.* 2. of the ſame Chapter, and by St. *Stephen* at *Acts* 7. 30. to be only *an Angel*; therefore called *Jehovah* and *God*, becauſe he repreſented the Perſon and Authority of God: but they prove this by Examples, and by very cogent Reaſons. *Moſes* tells the Iſraelites from God, *Exod.* 23. 20. "I ſend *an Angel* before "thee in the way, to bring thee in- "to the Place that I have prepared: "Beware of him, obey his Voice, "provoke him not; for he will not "pardon your Tranſgreſſions, for "*my Name is in him.* Who ſees not here, that the Meaning is, the Angel being to repreſent my Perſon, and to exerciſe my Authority, therefore *my Name is in him*; or therefore he is called by my Name, even Jehovah, or *the LORD:* which is the Name by which this Angel is all along called in the following Hiſtory, ſet down in the ſubſequent Chapters and Books of *Moſes.* Again, when it is ſaid at *Gen.* 7. 16. that *Noah* and his Sons, and the Creatures that were to be preſerved, being entred into the Ark, the LORD (Heb. *Jehovah*) ſhut them in; and when the Angel that wreſtled with *Jacob* is called (*Gen.* 32. 30.) *God:* is there not an abſolute neceſſity of ſaying, that theſe Angels had the Names *Jehovah* and *God* given to them, on the account that they were heavenly Meſſengers, that repreſented the Perſon of God? For is it congruous to ſay, *God ſhut the Door*; and *God*, wreſtling with *Jacob*, *prevailed not againſt him?* In a word, the *viri doctiſſimi* ſhow, firſt, that 'tis expreſly ſaid concerning a mere Angel, that *the Name of God was in him:* And next, that very often the Nature and Quality of the Action, that is imputed to the Perſon who bears the Names *Jehovah* and *God*, evinces, that the Perſon ſpoken of, is Jehovah and God, only by Repreſentation. But let us now weigh Dr. *Bull*'s Anſwers.

He ſaith, firſt, the Divine WORD, who is true God, might be called an Angel, when he appeared to *Moſes* in the Buſh; "Becauſe God appear- "ed *in ſuch manner*, as Angels are "wont to appear. But *we* cannot grant, that if God appears in *ſuch manner* as Angels are wont to appear, God may therefore be called an Angel: tho Dr. *Bull* deſires us, that *of all Love* we would *grant it*; for he only ſays it, and offers no manner of Proof, of ſo abſurd and (in very deed) impoſſible a Suppoſition. And we give this (inconteſtable) Reaſon, why the Perſon who appeared in the Buſh to *Moſes*, and is called ſometimes *Angel*, ſometimes *God*, was only an Angel who was called God on the Account that he repreſented God; becauſe if he were God, and therefore ſpoke theſe Words, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, in his own Name,

Name, not in the Name of another, or as repreſenting another: He ſhould have been called *God* only; and not *Angel, which is to ſay Meſſenger.* Nor do I know, why Dr. *Bull* pretends here, God is called an Angel in this Place, "Becauſe he appeared *in* "*ſuch manner* as Angels are wont to "appear: there was no Cauſe at all, why he ſhould ſay ſo; at leaſt there is nothing in the Text or Context, to countenance his ſo ſaying. But *our* Argument is extremely probable, while we ſay; if it was indeed (not an Angel, but) God himſelf that ſpake theſe Words, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, he could be only called *God*, and he was not at all *an Angel*, that is *a Meſſenger*. Briefly, 'tis (ſay I) a Chimera, founded on nothing, what Dr. *Bull* here ſays, that the true God is called an Angel in this Context, becauſe he appeared *in ſuch manner as Angels are wont to appear:* for the *manner of appearing* here was wholly *unuſual*; there never was any ſuch Appearance, whether by God or Angel, either before or ſince. But *we* argue ſolidly and concludingly, when we alledg; if it be not an Angel that ſpeaks here, in the Name and Perſon of God; but God himſelf, and in his own Name: 'tis againſt all Propriety and Grammar, that he is called (both by *Moſes* and St. *Stephen*) the Angel (or *Meſſenger*) *of the Lord.*

But Dr. *Bull* has a 2*d* Evaſion: "Several Fathers ſaid, an Angel in-"deed appeared in the Buſh; but "God was *in* the Angel: and it was "not the Angel that ſpoke, but God "in the Angel. *This is a Whimſy*, tho he ſhould quote an hundred *Fathers* for it. For if God himſelf was in the Fire, and the Voice was from God, not from the Angel, what need was there, that an Angel ſhould be there at all?

Laſtly, he ſays, 'tis an impious Opinion, that Angels ever (as it were) *acted the Perſon and Part of God*; by aſſuming *the incommunicable Name* Jehovah, and the Authority and Attributes of God. No Ambaſſador, he ſaith, ever took on him the Name and Stile of his Prince; but the Ambaſſador ſays only, *thus ſaith my Maſter.* He is a bold Man, to charge even Angels themſelves, and ſo many Writers of holy Scripture, *as ridiculous and impious*; for giving the Name *God* to thoſe that repreſent God. Has not our Saviour himſelf told us, that *they* alſo are called *Gods*, to whom the Word of God comes, that is, *the Magiſtracy*, as all confeſs. And for the Name *Jehovah*, which Dr. *Bull* calls the Incommunicable Name; I ask, how comes *Jehovah* to be a greater Name, or more incommunicable, than *God?* And why has he ſaid nothing to ſo many Inſtances as the Socinians, and his own *viri quidam doctiſſimi*, give of Perſons, and even of Places; on which the Name *Jehovah* is beſtowed, in the Hiſtorical Books of Scripture? What he ſays of Ambaſſadors ſerves only to ſhow, that he has forgot ſome part of his Academical Learning, and is but little acquainted

with

with the World. There is no Freſhman in *Oxford* or *Cambridg*, but will inform him, out of *the Roman Antiquities*; that Publick Meſſengers were wont to aſſume the Name and whole Stile of the Perſons whom they repreſented. The *Fecialis* or *Herald at Arms* denounced War, in theſe Terms; "I the King and Peo-"ple of *Rome* denounce and pro-"claim Hoſtility and War, againſt "the King and People of *N.* At this preſent time, in the Chriſtian Countries, Ambaſſadors in ſome Caſes, take on them the Name and Stile of their Prince; as in all Eſpouſals, and ſome other Caſes: but they *always* retain the Majeſty and Dignity of the Prince or State from whom they come; they always ſpeak with the Hat on; and their Perſons are *ſacroſanct*, that is, they cannot be arreſted, confined or puniſhed, they can only be required to depart out of the Kingdom. This whole Defence therefore of Dr. *Bull* is either *groundleſs*, or directly *falſe*. For if it had been God who ſpoke to *Moſes*, out of the Buſh, he being *preſent*, and ſpeaking *in his own Name* theſe Words, *I am the God of thy Fathers:* he could not have at all been called an *Angel*, that is *Meſſenger*. And if God himſelf, as Mr. *Bull* pretends, was in the Fire, there was no Occaſion, that an Angel alſo ſhould be there. And 'tis utterly falſe, that publick Meſſengers do not aſſume the Name, or the Stile, or Dignity of the Sovereigns that ſend them, and whom they repreſent. I ſhall therefore thank Dr. *Bull*, for giving up his Cauſe to the Socinians. For if it was the WORD (or Son) as he ſays, that appeared (in the Buſh) to *Moſes*; it follows, that the WORD is not God, but the Angel (or Meſſenger) of God: for he can never elude our Argument, that if the Perſon that ſpoke theſe Words, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, had been God himſelf ſpeaking *in his own Perſon*, and *there preſent*, he could not have been called *a Meſſenger* of the Lord either by *Moſes* or St. *Stephen*. Dr. *Bull* muſt of neceſſity grant, either that the WORD did not appear in the Buſh; which is to yield that his Fathers miſtook, in the chief Ground on which they built our Saviour's Pre-exiſtence: or that the WORD is but *a Meſſenger*, not God; which is to yield his Cauſe.

2. It is argued again, againſt Dr. *Bull*'s Fathers, by the *viri quidam doctiſſimi*, that indeed it is ſaid at Exod. 20. 1. *God ſpake all theſe Words*, namely the ten Commandments: but other Texts inform us, that God is ſaid to have ſpoke the Commandments, and given the Law; becauſe *it* and *they* were given and ſpoke by an Angel (attended or accompanied by other Angels) in the Perſon and Name of God, or *as repreſenting God*; Acts 7. 53. *They received the Law, by the Diſpoſition of Angels.* Gal. 3. 19. *It was ordained by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator*; *i. e.* it was commanded or ſpoken by Angels; yet not immediately to the People, but *by the Mediation*

diation (that is, the Intervention) of *Moſes*: the Angels ſpake it to *Moſes*, in the Mount; he to the People: *Heb.* 2. 2, 3. "If *the Word* "*ſpoke by Angels* was ſtedfaſt; "——how ſhall *we* eſcape, if we "neglect ſo great Salvation, which "at firſt began to be ſpoke by the "Lord [Jeſus,] and was confirm-"ed to us, by them that heard him? None ever doubted, that all theſe Texts ſpeak of *the Law*; and (the firſt and ſecond) of the ten Commandments more eſpecially: but we ſee 'tis here ſaid, they were *received from* Angels, were *ordained by* Angels, were *ſpoke by* Angels; of which the Meaning can only be, that the Angels ſpoke, ordained, and gave the Law, *in the Perſon of God*, or *as ſuſtaining the Name and Perſon of God*; we can no otherways reconcile theſe Texts, to thoſe other which impute the giving and ſpeaking the Law to God himſelf.

Whereas Dr. *Bull* replies; the Law indeed is ſometimes ſaid to be given by Angels, and ſpoke by Angels, becauſe they were preſent and attended when God gave the Law: Almighty God came, he ſaith, waited on by his Angels, to manifeſt his Greatneſs and Majeſty. I ask; ſeeing, according to Dr. *Bull*, God was *perſonally* preſent, nay it was he that ſpoke the Commandments and the Law: how could the Holy Scriptures ſay of the Angels, who aſſiſted only *as Attendants and Servants* in the Train of the Celeſtial King, that they *gave*, they *ordained*, they *ſpoke* the Law? If his Majeſty ſhould come to Parliament in his Robes, and other Marks of Sovereign and Legiſlative Power; but withal waited on by the Gentlemen of his Chamber, or others whom he thinks fit to call to him: will any one be ſo abſurd as to ſay, that *theſe Gentlemen made a moſt gracious Speech to the two Houſes?* The Scriptures often tell us, the Commandments and Law were *ſpoke*, were *ordained*, were *given* by Angels: True, ſays Dr. *Bull* out of his Fathers; for the Angels were preſent, they waited on God when he gave, ordained, and ſpoke the Law. Who ſees not, that at this rate of anſwering and arguing, he may alſo impute the Acts of our Kings and Parliaments, to their Mace-bearers and Door-keepers?

Whereas he refers us to *Deut.* 33. 2. and *Pſal.* 68. 17. as Texts that will prove to us, that God himſelf was with the Angels at *Sinai*, where the Commandments and Law were delivered: it had been but civil, if he had repeated the very Words of thoſe Texts. Readers (commonly) take it very unkindly, when (lazy) Authors ſend them of an Errand; and generally to a wrong Place too. It may be, I am reading below Stairs in my Parlor; my Bible is on the Stool, by my Bed-ſide, two Stories higher: is it good Manners in an Author, to oblige me to clamber up, with gouty Knees and Hands, into my Bed-chamber, to ſearch for certain Words which he himſelf durſt not recite, for fear I ſhould laugh at him?

him? Well, but I have look'd into the Texts, which Mr. *Bull* was aſhamed to relate: and I will aſſure our common Reader, that they do not at all ſay, that God was any more with the Angels in *Sinai*, than he is in all other Places; which is not ſuch a ſort of Preſence as will anſwer Mr. *Bull*'s Purpoſe. We doubt not, God was at *Sinai* in the midſt of the Angels; in ſuch Senſe, as it is ſaid by *David*, (*Pſal.* 68. 25.) "It is well ſeen my "God and King, how *thou goeſt* "*into the Sanctuary*; the Minſtrels "go *before*, the Singers *follow*, in "*the midſt* are Damſels playing with "Timbrels. Or as he is in the ordinary Congregations of ſuch as aſſemble to hear or pray. But *we* ſay, ſuch (general) Omnipreſence notwithſtanding; it is the Miniſter, not God, that (immediately) exhorts the Congregation: and at *Sinai* the Angels, not God, immediately gave and ſpoke the Law; that is, as repreſenting the Perſon of God, and by his eſpecial Mandate, Orders and Directions, they gave the Law and the Commandments.

3. Again, they object to Mr. *Bull*'s Fathers, *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. "God, who "at ſundry times, and in divers "manners, [as by Viſions, Dreams, "Apparitions of his Angels] ſpake "in times paſt by the Prophets to the "Fathers, hath *in theſe laſt Days* "ſpoken to *us by his Son*. Here now are Dr. *Bull*'s Fathers and St. *Paul* at utter Variance. St. *Paul* ſays, God *in times paſt* ſpoke to the Patriarchs and the Jewiſh Church by his Prophets, in divers manners; by Dreams, Apparitions of Angels, Viſions, Burdens, Inſpirations: but at length, *in theſe laſt Days*, in the Goſpel-Age with which the World ſhall conclude, he has ſpoke to us by his Son. Dr. *Bull*'s Fathers, on the contrary, pretend, that God ſpake all along in the Old Teſtament-times, not by a created Angel, but by his Son the eternal WORD. The Socinians are abſolutely of opinion, that *one* St. *Paul* is to be preferred, to *all* the Fathers: and tho on this Account they are reckoned grand Hereticks, yet they are content to be reproached for their Adherence to Scripture.

But what ſays Dr. *Bull*? He is never at a loſs, he anſwers. When St. *Paul* ſays, 'tis but *in theſe laſt Days*, or in the Goſpel-Age, that the Son of God hath ſpoken to Men; the Meaning is, he did not before *ſpeak immediately* to Men. How ſo; why not *immediately*, if he appeared *viſibly*, was heard *audibly*, and directed his Speech *immediately to the Perſon* (or Perſons) to whom he appeared? No, all this is not *immediate ſpeaking*, Dr. *Bull* ſays. 'Tis a hard Caſe truly; but when the Scriptures ſay farther, that God (that is, the Angel who repreſented God) *ſpake to* Moſes *face to face*, *as a Man to his Friend*; ſhall not this neither be *immediate ſpeaking*? Doubtleſs, it muſt not; for if it be, Dr. *Bull* has loſt his Cauſe; which is the only Reaſon, why, ſpeaking audibly, viſibly, face to face, and as a Man to his Friend, is not *immediate ſpeaking*. But when the

the Apoſtle ſays; 'tis but *in theſe laſt Days*, in the Goſpel-Age, that God hath ſpoke to Men by his Son: who gave Dr. *Bull* (or Friend *L. de Tena*) Authority to add to his Words *immediately*, or *immediatione ſuppoſiti?* The Apoſtle ſpeaks *in unlimited Terms*; it is, ſaith he, but only *in this Goſpel-Age* that God hath ſpoke to Men by his Son: fair and ſoftly, cries Dr. *Bull*; it muſt be underſtood *cum grano ſalis*, or good *Paul* is quite out; for when all is done, God ſpoke to Men by his Son, nay *by none but him*, from the very firſt. For the Son ſpoke to Men from the Beginning, in the Likeneſs of an Angel; *not indeed immediately*, but viſibly, audibly, as a Friend to his Friend; and directing alſo his Speech *immediately to the Perſon*, and to no other, to whom he at that time appeared. And this they call, interpreting of Scripture; their Cauſe indeed requires ſuch Interpreters.

But to prove, that the Lord Chriſt did indeed pre-exiſt; and was *that* Angel who led the Iſraelites thorow the Wilderneſs, Dr. *Bull* alledges 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. "And let us not *tempt* "*Chriſt*, as ſome of them alſo "tempted, and were deſtroyed of "Serpents. The Iſraelites then were deſtroyed of Serpents, for their tempting (that is, provoking) the Lord Chriſt with their Sins, while (in the Appearance of an Angel) he led them thorow the Wilderneſs. To this Text *Grotius* anſwers, that without doubt, *Let us not tempt Chriſt* is a falſe Reading: and that we ought to read with *the Alexandrian Copy*, "Let us not tempt *God*, "as ſome of them tempted, and "were deſtroyed of Serpents. Dr. *Bull* replies, the Authority of *the Alexandrian Copy* cannot be oppoſed to the Syriac, Latin and Arabick Verſions, to St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and *Theophylact*. Yes, *the Alexandrian Copy* is much antienter than any of thoſe Verſions or Fathers: the Latin (which is the firſt) was made by St. *Jerom*, above 100 Years after the Alexandrian Copy. But why has Dr. *Bull* ſuppreſſed it, that one of his own Hiſtorians (St. *Epiphanius*) has expreſly informed us, who was the particular Man that corrupted this Text: the Heretick *Marcion*, inſtead of *let us not tempt the Lord*, that is to ſay *God*, publiſhed in his Copies, *let us not tempt Chriſt: Epiphan. l.* 1. *T.* 1. *p.* 358. *Edit. Petav.* This Corruption is very antient, for *Marcion* (one of the firſt that defended our Saviour's Pre-exiſtence; and to ſupport that Doctrine, corrupted this Text) flouriſhed about the Year 150. But after the Nicene Council, 'tis no wonder that many Trinitarians followed (in this Text) the Copies of *Marcion*, as being then near 200 Years old; and it was after the Nicene Council, that all the Verſions and Fathers to whom Dr. *Bull* appeals concerning this Text, appeared.

But to confirm farther the Pre-exiſtence of the WORD, or Son of God, Dr. *Bull* dares pretend that 'tis

a part of the Jewiſh *Cabbala*, or traditional Knowledg, which that Nation derived from *Moſes*, he from God. Hereupon he cites ſome Words of the (Apocryphal) *Wiſdom of Solomon*, which (according to him) is a very antient Book; alſo ſome Expreſſions of *Philo Judæus*, ſuppoſed to be a Jew by Religion as well as by Nation: He appeals alſo to the Chaldee Paraphraſes (or Tranſlations of the Old Teſtament by *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*) as if theſe ſpake of the WORD, as a Perſon, and the great Meſſenger of God, under the Old Teſtament: And finally, he ſays, *Maſius* (on *Joſhua*) has quoted a certain Rabbi, and an old Jewiſh Book called *Tanchumam*, which ſpeak of the WORD much after the manner as doth the Author of the *Wiſdom of* Solomon.

He ſaith firſt, that the Pre-exiſtence of the WORD, as a Divine Almighty Perſon, and as the Son of God, is a part of the Jewiſh *Cabbala*, or traditional Knowledg: Then, to prove this, he cites Paſſages out of *Philo*, the Wiſdom of *Solomon*, the Paraphraſes of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, a certain Rabbi, and the Book *Tanchumam*. He thinks, it ſhould ſeem, that theſe Jewiſh Writers had their Notion of the WORD, from the Jewiſh *Cabbala*. I cannot but wonder, I confeſs, that a Proteſtant Divine ſhould believe the Jewiſh *Cabbala*; or think that the Jews had *a traditional Knowledg* or Inſtitution, concerning God and Religion, diſtinct from the Books of *Moſes* and the Prophets. I had thought, that all Proteſtants, nay all Chriſtians, were agreed, that the *Cabbala* is the Invention of the Phariſees and Maſters of the Phariſaical Sect, not a Tradition from *Moſes*. If the *Cabala* had come from *Moſes*; or had it been acknowledged by the Prophets and antient Jewiſh Church, as of Divine Revelation and Inſtitution: it would have been often mentioned, appealed and alluded to, in the Books of the Old Teſtament; and there is no queſtion that *Ezra* (when he made the Collection of Canonical Books and Monuments, immediately after the Return from the Babyloniſh Captivity) would have had an eſpecial Care of the Divine *Cabala*, or Traditional Knowledg. He would have committed it to Writing, leſt it ſhould be loſt or corrupted: He would have added it to the Canon of Scripture, when he collected all other Pieces that had been written by the Prophets, or other holy Men; He that has left to us the Proverbs of *Solomon*, his Book of Love, nay the Story of *Ruth*, would not have neglected the Divine *Cabala*. But I ſhall put this Dilemma to Dr. *Bull*; let him take it by which Horn he likes beſt. Either the *Cabala* of the Jews is of *humane Invention*, or of *divine Appointment and Revelation*. If the former, why has he quoted (in ſo great a Queſtion as this now before us) a ſpurious Work, an Impoſture, an impious (Phariſaical) Addition to the Holy Scripture: will ſuch fraudulent Arts as theſe, help or credit

credit his Cauſe? If the other, if the *Cabala* is a Tradition of Divine Revelation and Inſtitution; 'tis of equal Authority with the Writings of *Moſes* and the Prophets; and Dr. *Bull* ought to bind it up, with the other two Parts of Holy Scripture, namely the Old and New Teſtaments. Dr. *Bull* may do as he pleaſes; but the Socinians acquieſce in that Judgment which our Saviour himſelf has made of the *Cabala*, at *Mat.* 15. 6, 9. where he calls this Traditional Law, *the Commandments of Men*, a mere humane (Phariſaical) Figment; he adds there, that by this Tradition of theirs they contradicted and *made void* the true and genuine *Commandments of God.* It is in vain therefore that Mr. *Bull* tells us of a *Cabala* of the Jews; of which he (precariouſly, and without having read it, or ſo much as knowing what it is) ſuppoſes, that it not only ſpeaks of the WORD, but ſpeaks of it as *a Perſon* and *the Son of God:* and afterwards, falls to citing ſome Jewiſh Authors; who from this *Cabala* (as he again untruly ſuppoſes) diſcourſe of the WORD as a pre-exiſtent Perſon, the Son of God by Generation, and God's Meſſenger and Miniſter during the times of the Old Teſtament. I ſay, this Pretence of Dr. *Bull* is vain, becauſe ſuppoſing the *Cabala* did ſpeak of the WORD, as a Perſon and the Son of God, pre-exiſtent to the Creation it ſelf; and ſuppoſing again, that the Jewiſh Authors (whom he cites) had taken their Doctrine from the *Cabala:* yet what will all this avail, when the *Cabala* it ſelf is (ſo certainly) not a Tradition from *Moſes* or God; but a (mad) Collection of Follies and Chimeras, the ſickly Dreams of the (Fanatical) Phariſees.

The Jewiſh *Cabala* is ſo far from owning a Trinity, that this very Doctrine of (Apoſtate) Chriſtians, is the chief Offence that the Jews take at the Chriſtian Religion: it is the great thing that their learned Men (in all Books and Conferences) object to us, that we have departed from the firſt Commandment, and have advanced a ſecond and a third God. Farther, they as little believe the WORD, when taken (in the Platonick Senſe, namely) for a Perſon; or that God has a Son, who was his Miniſter in the Creation of all things, and his Meſſenger or Angel to the Patriarchs. In ſhort, neither now nor formerly have the Jews believed, that the WORD is the Son of God, but only his Power, Energy and Virtue. Dr. *Bull* will never produce any thing of the *Cabala*, that but looks this way. And ſee here, what *Origen*, who flouriſhed about the Year 220, ſays of the Jews; "I have diſputed often, *ſays this* "*moſt learned Father*, with the Jewiſh Rabbins that were of moſt "Eſteem; but I could never meet "with any of them, who approve "this Doctrine, that *the WORD is* "*the Son of God:* *Contr. Celſum*, *l.* 2. *p.* 79. Again, *l.* 4. *p.* 162. he is more expreſs in the caſe; "*Cel-*"*ſus* is ignorant that the Jews do

" not believe, that the Meſſias (or " Chriſt) whom they ſtill expect as " to come, is not God, nor the *Son* " *of God.* But Dr. *Bull* himſelf, tho here (to ſerve the preſent turn) he contends that the Jewiſh *Cabala* ſpeaks of the WORD as a Perſon and the Son of God, elſewhere (*Judic. Eccl. p.* 170.) owns and proves, that " the Jews do not expect any Meſſi- " as or Chriſt, promiſed to them by " their Prophets, but who ſhall be *a* " *mere Man.* And he cites *Tripho* the Jew, ſaying, " We Jews expect " a Chriſt, who is a Man, born of " Men. But if this was the Opini- on of the Jews concerning Chriſt, that he ſhall be a Man only; why does Mr. *Bull* pretend in this Place, that the *Cabala* (or Traditional Do- ctrine of the Jews) which by them is ſuppoſed to be of Divine Revelati- on, teaches the contrary, namely that the Chriſt is to be a Divine Perſon, the eternal Son of God, and himſelf alſo God? He will never reconcile theſe Contradictions to himſelf. But let us now examine, of what Autho- rity his Quotations, out of ſome Jewiſh Books, are.

His firſt Citation is out of the A- pocryphal Book of Wiſdom; *Wiſd.* 18.15,16. " Thy Almighty WORD " leap'd down from Heaven, out of " his Royal Throne; as a fierce " Man of War, into a Land deſti- " ned to Deſtruction. He brought " thine unfeigned Commandment, " as a ſharp Sword; and ſtanding " up, filled all things with Death: " he touched the Heaven, tho he " ſtood upon the Earth. In ſober Sadneſs, this was a terrible WORD: his Feet ſtood on plain Ground, and yet his Head touched (not the Clouds or the Æther, but) Heaven it ſelf; and with his Death-dealing Fauchion, he even depopulated the whole Coun- try, in a few Minutes. 'Tis ſuffici- ent however, I ſuppoſe, to ſober People, if we ſay hereupon, that this ſame was only a Chimerical, not a real *Almanzor*; and that there is no Body but Dr. *Bull*, that will ever be afraid of his Puiſſance. But Dr. *Bull* objects, that however this Paſ- ſage ſerves to ſhow, that the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom*, who was a Jew, believed the WORD. Right, but then he ſhould have obſerved too, that the Book as we now have it, muſt be as much reckoned to the Tranſlator who was a Chriſtian, as to the firſt Writer of it, who (it may be) was a Jew. Let us hear *Gro- tius*, in his Preface to his Annotati- ons on this Book: " The Book of " *Wiſdom* was written by a Jew, " who lived after the times of *Ez-* " *ra:* but ſome Chriſtian or other " (who was a Greek) hapning on " it, he hath given it us in the Greek " Tongue, but with divers Additi- " ons to it, taken from the Chriſti- " an Religion. Of this kind, no Man will doubt it, is this Deſcription of the WORD, which is wholly Chriſtian, as Chriſtianity began to be taught about the middle of the ſecond Age: the Jews, as we have heard from *Origen*, never believed ſuch a kind of WORD; namely, that

that is a Perſon, the Son of God, or God.

His next Allegation is from the Paraphraſes of *Onkelos* and *Jonathan*, Jews that tranſlated the Old Teſtament into Syro-Chaldaick, after a Paraphraſtical way. But I cannot perceive, that any of his Citations out of theſe Paraphraſes ſpeak of the WORD in the Platonick Senſe; namely, as a Perſon, or as a God: but only in the Jewiſh and Socinian Senſe; namely, as the Energy and Power of God, or God's *powerful effectual Mandate*. As to his laſt Quotation, from a Paraphraſe of *Jonathan* on the Pſalms; which has ſome Appearance of being to the purpoſe for which Mr. *Bull* alledged it: whereas *Jonathan* ſeems to read, *the Lord ſaid to his WORD, Sit on my right Hand*; *Jonathan*'s Words may better be rendred thus, *the Lord ſaid by his WORD*, (*i. e.* his Mandate or Decree) *Sit on my right Hand.*

But *Philo* ſpeaks home; he (expreſly) calls the WORD *the Son of God*, his *firſt-begotten Son:* to whoſe Care (ſaith he farther) as to the Vicarius and Deputy of God, the whole Creation is committed; and by whom it was originally made. But I ſhall never believe, that a Jew by Religion, wrote thoſe things concerning the WORD, that we ſee in *Philo*'s Works. *Euſebius* ſuſpects, *Photius* directly affirms, that *Philo* was a Chriſtian. This laſt adds, that by occaſion of ſome Diſpleaſure taken, *Philo* departed from the Chriſtian Religion. I believe, with *Euſebius* and *Photius*, that *Philo* was a Chriſtian: but I make no queſtion, that *Euſebius* is miſtaken in thinking, that this is the *Philo* who was ſent on an Ambaſſage to the Emperor *C. Caligula*; but a *Philo* of the ſecond Age, toward the expiring of it, or of the 2*d* Age juſt expiring. For he deſcribes the *Therapeuta*, that is the Chriſtians, both in their Diſcipline, their Studies, and their manner of interpreting Holy Scripture; not as they lived or were in the Apoſtolick Times, but in the Cloſe of the ſecond (and Beginning of the third) Age.

Laſtly, as to the (obſcure) Rabbi cited by *Maſius*, and the (unknown) Book *Tankumam*, enough has been ſaid to evince that if they ſpeak of the WORD as the Son of God, they may be written perhaps in Rabbinical Hebrew, and by Jews by Nation, but ſuch Jews as were come over to the Chriſtian Religion; there being nothing more certain than that the Jews never owned a Son of God in any other Senſe but of Adoption, Sanctification, Exaltation, and ſuch like; nor do I think, that Dr. *Bull* himſelf will again inſiſt on Jewiſh Authorities, whether they be theſe or any other. He ſhould make himſelf ridiculous to all learned Men, by perſevering in ſuch a notorious Miſtake as this; that the Jews either now, or in any time paſt, believed the WORD as a Perſon, or that God begat a Son, who was pre-exiſtent to the World, and was (together with God) the Creator of it: 'tis for this very Doctrine, that the Jews have

pre-

pretended ever ſince the Council of *Nice*, and at this *day* do pretend, that Chriſtianity is a Revolt to Heatheniſm and Paganiſm.

There remains now but one thing more in Dr. *Bull*'s *Defence of the Nicene Faith*, that I intend to conſider in this *firſt Part* of my Anſwer to him; his Explication of the Trinity: or how three Divine Perſons and Spirits, each of which has all Divine Perfections, and is ſingly and by *himſelf* God, nay *perfect* God, are (for all that) but one God.

On the Explication of the Trinity, according to the Fathers and Dr. Bull.

THAT *three* Divine Spirits and Perſons, each of which has all poſſible (real) Perfections, and therefore is (ſingly and by himſelf, as the Athanaſian Creed ſpeaks) a moſt perfect God, are but one God, is ſo monſtrous a Paradox; that we might juſtly wonder, ſuch a contradictory and impoſſible Doctrine being (unhappily) got abroad, was not immediately hiſſed again, into the Hole, from whence the *Chimera* firſt ſallied; did we not know, that the Propagation and Conſervation of this Affront to common Senſe, and to all the Principles of Knowledg and Silence, was the Work and Effect of ſuch *penal Laws*, as would equally have reſtored the whole Body and Syſtem of Paganiſm. While the Queſtion about the Trinity was diſputed, only *by Argument* and *Authorities of Holy Scripture*; the Proverb was, *all the World is againſt* Athanaſius, *and* Athanaſius *is againſt all the World.* And in *Conſtantinople* it ſelf, the then capital City of the whole Roman Empire, the Trinitarian *Conventicle* was ſo thin, that it had more Benches than Men to ſit on them: and their Preacher was forced to comfort his almoſt empty Fold with ſuch Reflections as theſe: "The Unitaries, *ſays* "*he*, have the Churches, but we "*(we Trinitarians)* are the Temples of God; they have the Peo- "ple, but the Angels are with us: "my Flock indeed is little, I eaſily "tell all my Sheep; but they hear "my Voice, they follow me, and "will not follow Strangers. *Greg. Nazianz.* Serm. 35. againſt the Arians. But the Empire falling at length to a Prince, who was a bigotted Trinitarian; he applied the Imperial Authority, and the Awe of his Armies, which conſiſted (for the moſt part) of Souldiers and Officers who had been born (bred and continued) Pagans, to eſtabliſh Trinitarianiſm by Terrors and Force. He ('twas *Theodoſius*) and his Succeſſors began with taking the Churches, from all Unitarians, *by military Force*: then they were prohibited to hold their Aſſemblies, Conventicles they were now called,

called, within the Precincts of Cities or Towns. Next, he called general Councils, but admitted none to Seſſion or Vote but Trinitarians: to whoſe Creeds and Canons, all that ſtood for any (the very leaſt) Church-Preferment, muſt ſubſcribe, before they were admitted to their Places. Afterwards, all Diſputes againſt the Decitions of theſe Councils were forbid to all without Exception: to Churchmen and military Officers, on pain of Depoſition; to Lay-men, if they were free, under the Penalty of Baniſhment; to Servants, under pain of corporal Chaſtiſement, and that too (ſaith the Law) *after the ſevereſt manner.* They proceeded farther, they required all Perſons, to deliver up all Heretical Books, that they might be publickly burnt; denouncing horrible Puniſhments to ſuch as ſhould preſume to hide or conceal any ſuch Books. While the Civil Power acted his Part in this (outragious) manner, the Eccleſiaſticks were as induſtrious another way: the Underlings of them ſought the Favour of their Superiours, by turning Informers againſt the Hereticks and their Aſſemblies; others (that could read and write) took upon them the corrupting, or as they then ſpoke, *the correcting* the Bibles; adding and leaving out as themſelves pleaſed. Nor would they have left to us, any Remain of genuine Chriſtianity; or ſuffer'd a ſingle Unitarian to eſcape their Barbarities: but that their Diviſions concerning their own Doctrine, their own Diſputes *de Aſini umbrâ*, diverted often their Rage and Treachery, from the Scriptures and the Unitaries, to the Members of their own Party and Communion. Dares Dr. *Bull*, or any other, deny any thing of this? when they do, this (and much more) ſhall be proved upon them, from the moſt allowed of their own Hiſtorians, and from *the Codes* which contain the Imperial Conſtitutions.

We may ſay then, that Trinitarianiſm is not ſo much a Religion, as the Law of the *Bizantine* (or *Conſtantinopolitan*) Emperors; it was firſt introduced by military Force, then confirmed by Edicts of the Arbitrary Emperors of *Conſtantinople.* Well, but when Folly and Impiety are once eſtabliſh'd by Law, and are the only way to Preferment, there will never want a great Number, who will court the Favour of the Government, by endeavouring to repreſent the current Doctrine of the Times, as poſſible, nay as reaſonable and agreeable to Scripture: and from hence came the Explications of the Trinity, by *the Paraſites* of thoſe times; whom now, in regard of their Antiquity, we call *the Fathers.* Theſe Explications were various, and contrary to one another; Dr. *Bull* has made choice of the moſt tolerable and paſſable Accounts given by the Fathers: and tho he has patchrd up one Hypotheſis (or Explication) out of many and divers, I will be content to take it, as he gives it. He repreſents it, as the ordinary Explication, of all the Fathers; as well

the

the Ante-nicene as Poſt-nicene: let us ſee what it is, and then make our Reflections upon it.

They ſaid, there are *three* infinite Perſons, known by the Names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; each of which has all Divine Perfections, and in their *higheſt* Degree. They are ſo many *diſtinct*, tho not *divided* or ſeparated Subſtances and Eſſences: they are as much three Spirits, as they are three Subſtances and Perſons; each has his own proper and perſonal diſtinct Underſtanding, Will, and (Almighty) Energy. It is true, that they ſaid alſo, that the three Divine Perſons are conſubſtantial, or have *the ſame* Subſtance: but they did not mean thereby *the ſelf-ſame* Subſtance, or the ſame Subſtance *in Number*, but the ſame for Kind and Properties; that is, their Subſtances are (alike) Divine, Immortal, and Unchangable. They are conſubſtantial to one another, as Stars are conſubſtantial to Stars; that is, their Subſtances, tho divers in Number, have the ſame Properties and Qualities. In ſhort, the Father, Son and Spirit, are *diſtinct* (intellectual) Subſtances; and are conſubſtantial (or of *the ſame* Subſtance) as their Subſtances or Eſſences are alike infinite, immutable and immortal: they are alſo (and therefore) diſtinct *Beings*; and becauſe they are intellectual and ſpiritual, they are three *Minds* and three *Spirits*, as much as they are three Perſons and Subſtances. Laſtly, becauſe each has all poſſible (real) Perfections, therefore each of them is *true God*.

I dare to affirm before-hand, that Dr. *Bull* is ſo well ſatisfied, that this is the Notion that the Fathers had of the Trinity, that he will own it for theirs and his, and will not (diſingenuouſly) deny that he intended this Explication or Account of the Trinity, in the ſeveral Chapters of his *Defence of the Nicene Faith*, where he ſpeaks (either deſignedly or incidentally) of this Point. And his Book has given him ſuch a Reputation all over *Europe*, even in the Catholick Countries; and his Citations out of the Fathers, ſo plainly evince, that this was their Senſe; that (I believe) no Trinitarian will be ſo raſh or hardy, as to call him Heretick, or to attack or write againſt him as ſuch; tho others (of leſs Eſteem) are now loudly challenged of Hereſy, for this very Explication. In very deed, it is the Doctrine of the (Poſt-nicene) Fathers, and of all the *real* Trinitarians: and ſince the Revival of theſe Controverſies, divers learned Writers (by Name Dr. *Cudworth*, the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, the Biſhop of *Gloceſter*, Dr. *Sherlock*, Mr. *How*, and others) imbrace this Notion of the Trinity. 'Tis not unlikely, that (by degrees) it will exclude the (Sabellian Nominal) Trinity of the Schools; and not only exclude it, but be the Occaſion that it ſhall be declared *Heretical*. 'Tis true, that more commonly in Univerſities, they go the way of the Schools; but the ſcholaſtick Trinity implies ſo many Follies, and is ſo certainly nothing elſe but a diſguiſed

Sa-

Sabellianiſm: that *the real* Trinitarians may probably enough carry their Point againſt the Nominals; if the Difference between them, breaking out into a Contention, ſhall fall into the Hands of able Managers.

We have ſeen how the Fathers underſtood the Trinity; but the Difficulty is ſtill behind: how did they make out the Unity of God? For if there are three ſpiritual intellectual *Subſtances*, three infinite *Spirits*, three (eternal, all-knowing and all-powerful) *Minds*, Three, each of which is a *perfect God:* do we not loſe the Unity of God, the principal Article of revealed Religion, and the grand Deſign of both the Teſtaments, while we believe and affirm three ſuch Perſons? Dr. *Bull* here offers his Hand, at a dead lift; he tells us, the Fathers eaſily came off from this Exception or Doubt, by ſaying,

1. The Son and Spirit had their Original, their Being, and Godhead, from the Father: therefore having proceeded from him as their Principle and Fountain, they are not diſtinct Gods from him, but one God with him. The Fathers granted, that were not the Son and Spirit originated from the Father, the three Divine Perſons being ſo many *ſeveral Principles*, would alſo be ſo many *Gods:* but becauſe the Son and Spirit are not (as the Father) ſelf-originated or unoriginated, but from the Father; therefore they are rightly ſaid to be one God with him.

Every one ſees, that there lies this Exception, againſt this Account of the Unity of God. If to be originated from the Father, will make the Perſons ſo originated to be one God with him, or one with him and with one another; it follows, that not only the Son and Holy Spirit, but Angels alſo and Men (nay the whole Creation, the very vileſt Parts of it) ſhall be one God with the Father, and with the (pretended) Trinity, and one with one another, becauſe they are all originated from the Father. Therefore the Fathers ſaid,

2. *Bare Origination* from the Father, will not conſtitute the Perſons ſo originated one God (or one) with him, or with one another, unleſs they *have the ſame Subſtance with the Father*; that is, as has been ſaid, *the ſame for Kind and Properties.* And this Conſideration, they ſaid, excludes *all Creatures* from being one God or one with the Father, or the bleſſed Trinity: for *created* Subſtances are finite, ſubject to Change and Accidents. In a word, they are *wholly unlike to the Divine Subſtance.*

They foreſaw, that it would be again objected here. If to be originated from another, who is *of the ſame kind* with the Perſons ſo originated from him, will make them all to be one; for Inſtance, will make the Son and Spirit to be truly one, and one God, with the Father from whom they are originated: then two Sons, or a Son and Grandſon, becauſe they are originated from the ſame Father, and are *of the ſame kind* with him, ſhall alſo be one with him; they ſhall not be three *Men*,

but one *Man*, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are not three Gods, but one God. To wind themſelves from this moſt certain and ſolid Reaſoning, the Fathers deviſed a third Elution, as wiſe as either of the two former: they ſaid that,

3. Origination of two Perſons from a firſt Perſon, tho they are all *of the ſame kind*, will not make them one, or one God; except (as it moſt luckily happens between the three Divine Perſons) the originated Perſons are propagated *interiori productione*: that is, are generated by an internal Production, ſo that they are (always and inſeparably) in the Perſon that produced them. And this at length is the Fathers whole Explication of a Trinity in Unity. They ſaid, in ſhort, three diſtinct Divine Perſons, Subſtances, Spirits, each of which is (ſingly and by himſelf) a perfect God, are notwithſtanding but one God; becauſe the ſecond and third Perſons *are originated from the firſt*, and are *of the ſame Kind and Properties with him*, and are generated or propagated *by an internal Production*, ſo that they inſeparably and always *remain in the Father, and he in them*. This, in effect, is to ſay; that naturally, properly and truly ſpeaking, there are three Gods, or there are *three Gods in Number*: but in regard that God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, are *of the ſame kind* with God the Father, are *originated from him*, and are eternally and inſeparably *in him*; they may (in a Catachreſtical, improper and reſpective Senſe) all be called one God.

I will examine very particularly, the whole Hypotheſis of theſe Fathers, their Trinity of Subſtances, Minds and Spirits; and their Explication (now laid down) how three ſuch Perſons and (Divine) Minds can be but one God? Only for preventing (if it may be) future Cavils, I would firſt take notice, that *this Explication* of the Unity of God (or how *three* Perſons can be but one God) by the Fathers and Dr. *Bull*, evidently ſuppoſes, that they held the three Divine Perſons are ſo many diſtinct Subſtances, Minds, and Spirits, as well as diſtinct Perſons.

I think, 'tis ſufficient, to prove that the Fathers held the three Perſons are ſo many diſtinct *Spirits* and *Minds*, in that they ſo certainly affirmed them to be *diſtinct ſpiritual Subſtances*: if the three Divine Perſons are three diſtinct Subſtances, all Men (the very nominal Trinitarians themſelves) will grant, that they are diſtinct Minds and Spirits. Dr. *Bull* hath inconteſtably proved, by a great Number of Quotations, and might have proved by a great many more; that by conſubſtantial, or *of the ſame Subſtance*, the Fathers meant not the ſame Subſtance *in Number*, but the ſame *in Properties*. As Stars are conſubſtantial to Stars, and the Bodies of Men to the Bodies of Beaſts; becauſe they are Subſtances *of the ſame kind* (that is, corporeal) and *of the ſame Properties*, for all Stars are *lucid*, and the Bodies of Men and Beaſts are *organized*,

ganized, and *ſubject to Alteration*: So are the three Divine Perſons conſubſtantial, being of the ſame kind, that is to ſay *ſpiritual*; and having the ſame Properties, namely Eternity, Immutability, Omnipreſence, and the other Divine Attributes. I will undertake for it, that none of the Nominal Trinitarians (as angry as ſome of them are) will ever attempt to confute Dr. *Bull*'s firſt Chapter of his ſecond Section; where he gives this Account of the word Conſubſtantial, out of the Fathers. But if the Divine Perſons are therefore Conſubſtantial, becauſe they are of like kind, and have the ſame Properties; their Subſtance is not *the ſame in Number*, but only (as Dr. *Bull* ſpeaks) *the ſame in Nature*. And if this be true, as inconteſtably it is, that the Fathers believed the three Divine Perſons to be ſo many *diſtinct* ſpiritual Subſtances in Number: it will be controverted by no Body, that they are alſo (in the Judgment of the Fathers) *diſtinct* Minds and Spirits.

Secondly; But (as I ſaid) the before-mentioned Explications of the Unity of God, or how the three Divine Perſons are yet but one God, are another, and an invincible Declaration; that they held the ſaid Perſons are three Minds, Spirits and Subſtances. If the Fathers had held, that the three Perſons are but one only (numerical) Subſtance, one infinite Spirit, one omniſcient Mind and Energy; and that they are called Perſons, only becauſe the one (numerical) Subſtance ſubſiſts *in three Modes*, that is, *after three ſeveral manners*: I ſay, if this had been the Opinion of the Fathers, the Queſtion would not have been, how the *three* Perſons can be but one God, but *how they can be called Hypoſtaſes or Perſons?* As at this day, no Man is ſo fooliſh, as to charge the Nominal Trinitarians with Tritheiſm, or holding three Gods; but only with *Gotham* Philoſophy and Divinity, in calling *Modes* (or a Subſtance ſubſiſting after three manners) *Perſons*, when it is ſo obvious that Modes are not Perſons, but certain Affections and accidental Denominations belonging to Perſons. The Fathers would never have troubled themſelves, nor would any ever have objected it to them, or demanded it of them; how they could ſay there is but one God, if the three Perſons (by them ſo called) were but one (numerical) Subſtance ſubſiſting three manner of ways, or in three relative Modes: all the Queſtion (as I ſaid) would have been, what they meant by this Gibberiſh, *ſubſiſting in three Modes or three manner of ways?* What Occaſion was there for the Fathers to tell us, the three Divine Perſons may be called one God; becauſe the Son and Spirit are originated from the Father, are like to him in all Divine Properties, and ſubſiſt in him: what need, I ſay, was there of theſe Excuſes, or how are they poſſibly applicable to the three Divine Perſons; if the Perſons were not taken to be ſo many Spirits, Minds and Subſtances, but only a threefold manner of Subſiſtence of

the ſame (numerical) Subſtance, Mind and Spirit?

I omit (for the preſent) a great deal that might be farther ſaid on this Subject; becauſe when the Nominal Trinitarians have called, till they are hoarſe, weary and aſham'd, to Univerſities and Biſhops to eſpouſe their Cauſe, and to cenſure the real Trinitarians: after all, the very Names by which the three Divine Perſons are called (*a* Father, *his* Son, an Holy Spirit diſtinct from both) do ſo manifeſtly imply thoſe Perſons to be diſtinct Beings, Subſtances, Minds and Spirits, and not Modes or Relations only of the ſelf-ſame numerical Being and Spirit; that it will always be carried againſt them, by the Majority of conſidering Divines. All their Appeals notwithſtanding, it will not be long, e're they are told by their Superiors in the Church, that 'tis expedient for them to be quiet, leſt themſelves be cenſured as Sabellians, or as we now ſpeak Unitarians. To ſum up all, I ſay, the Fathers held that the three Divine Perſons are three diſtinct (ſpiritual, intellectual) Subſtances, three Minds, three Spirits: this appears, ſay I farther, *by their Explications of the word Conſubſtantial*; by their Anſwers to this Queſtion, *how three ſuch Perſons can be but one God*; and by the Terms which they uſe concerning the three Perſons, *a Father, his Son, a Spirit diſtinct from both.*

Theſe things being, I ſuppoſe, ſufficiently eſtabliſh'd, we may rely on it, that Dr. *Bull* will not deny that I have truly reported what the Fathers (the Poſt-nicene Fathers ſay I, but Dr. *Bull* ſays *all* the Fathers) held, both concerning the three Divine Perſons, and how we muſt underſtand them to be but one God. Therefore now, I will examine his whole Hypotheſis; it hath theſe Parts. 1. There are three Divine Hypoſtaſes, or *intellectual Subſtances*, three omniſcient almighty *Minds* and *Spirits*; each of theſe has all Divine Perfections, and is ſingly and by himſelf a moſt compleat and perfect God. 2. Yet doth not this contradict that moſt great and indiſputable Truth, viſible in the Works of Creation, and aſcertained by Revelation of holy Scripture; that there is but one God: becauſe of the three Divine Hypoſtaſes and Spirits before deſcribed, the ſecond and third are originated from the firſt; have the ſame Nature and Properties, that he has; and are propagated from him by an internal Production, ſo that they are always inſeparably in him, and he in them, by a mutual Pervaſion, Immeation or Penetration.

There is no neceſſity that I ſhould concern my ſelf, againſt the firſt of theſe Propoſitions; for if I diſprove the ſecond, the firſt will fall of it ſelf: if *three* Hypoſtaſes or Spirits cannot be one God, this ſort of Trinitarians muſt either give up their three diſtinct Subſtances, their three Minds and Spirits; or openly profeſs, that they believe three Gods. Notwithſtanding, it will not be amiſs, or beſides our Purpoſe, if we ſhow

theſe

theſe Gentlemen, that whatever Arguments militate againſt a Plurality of Gods, prove alſo (no leſs effectually and directly) that there can be but one Divine (intellectual) Subſtance, but one infinite Spirit and Mind.

How do Philoſophers and Divines eſtabliſh the Unity of God; or, that there neither is, nor can be more than one God? They ſay; all Plurality of Beings of the ſame kind and ſort, is from the Imbecillity, Weakneſs and Unſufficiency (in ſome reſpect or other) of thoſe Beings: for if a Being be abſolutely perfect, infinite in all Perfections, all-ſufficient for it ſelf, and for the Beings to which it relates; there is no need, that it ſhould be multiplied, or be more than one. We ſee, ſay they, that all Nature has nothing that is ſuperfluous, nothing in vain; where-ever one of the ſort is ſufficient, as one *Sun* and ſuch like, the Individuals of that kind never proceed beyond Unity. But the Divine Nature, as the moſt excellent of all, will much more exclude all Multiplicity: more *Infinites*, more *All-ſufficients*, would be ſuch an impertinent Repetition, ſo altogether vain and to no purpoſe, that we cannot think of it, without immediately rejecting it. This is the firſt Argument, uſed by Philoſophers, to prove the Unity of God; no Body will conteſt it, that it equally proves but one infinite *Spirit*, one all-ſufficient *Mind*, one abſolutely perfect *Being*.

They ſay again; it implies a Contradiction, that there ſhould be more than one all-ſufficient God, Mind or Spirit; becauſe ſuch a Suppoſition pretends to make an infinite Addition (of the ſame kind) to what is (already) infinite, and to increaſe All-ſufficiency.

And, if there are more Gods, or more Minds and Spirits, infinite in their Perfections, either they are all of them unoriginated; or one only is unoriginated, and the reſt are derived from him by Generation or Creation. The Trinitarians, with whom we have now to do, anſwer; that only one, the Father, is unoriginated, the other Perſons are propagated from him. But they can never anſwer, either why the Father ſhould propagate from himſelf, only two Spirits as perfect as himſelf; or why, ſeeing thoſe two are as perfect as he, *they* alſo ſhould not generate their like? If the two propagated Perſons and Spirits *cannot* generate their like; they are not ſuch perfect Beings as the Father is: and conſequently are neither Gods, nor abſolutely perfect Spirits. If it be ſaid only, they *will not* generate their like, becauſe three abſolutely perfect Spirits are enough; 'tis not only frivolous, but ſilly: for if *three* perfect Spirits are more deſirable by one another, or more neceſſary to the World than *one* ſuch Spirit or Mind, by an unavoidable Parity of Reaſon, ſeven or ten Spirits and Minds, that are all-ſufficient and abſolutely perfect, muſt be more deſirable, and more requiſite to the World than Three. Again,

It was *Ariſtotle* that obſerved, and 'tis an Obſervation worthy of ſo great a Man; that the Unity of God is diſcernable in the Conſtitution and Frame of the World. For ſuch is the Uniformity and good Order of the whole; and all the Parts (both in their *Qualities* and *Motions*) ſo manifeſtly tend to one and the ſame End, namely the Service of Man, and the Conſervation of the World it ſelf in its preſent State; moreover, theſe Parts continue in their firſt Motion and Courſe, ſo *ſtedfaſtly* and invariably: that it appears they were contrived, and are regulated, not by more Gods, Makers, or Almighty Spirits, but by one only Law and Mind.

Laſt of all, that there is an all-wiſe God; we prove beyond Contradiction, by that perpetual Wiſdom, Contrivance and good Senſe, which is ſeen in the *Whole* and the *Parts* of the World; and which muſt be previous to the World and its Parts, elſe how came (blind unthinking) Matter into ſuch a *wiſe* Order? But we have no manner of Proof, not the leaſt Intimation, that there are more ſuch Gods; as undoubtedly there would be, both in Nature and by Revelation, if indeed there were more ſuch.

Theſe Reaſons have always perſwaded all Philoſophers and Divines, that there is but one (ſupreme and infinite) *God*; and they proceed as directly againſt more infinite *all-perfect* and *creating* Spirits or Minds, as againſt more Gods. In very deed, there never was any Philoſopher that made any Diſtinction, between three *Gods* and three infinite *Minds* and *Spirits*: he would have been eſteemed not in his right Senſes, by the Philoſophers, who ſhould talk of *one* God and *three* infinite all-perfect Spirits; with them, one God, and one all-perfect Spirit were convertible Terms, and uſed for each other; and indeed they ever will be, by all that conſider what they ſay.

But Dr. *Bull*, and the Fathers whom he follows, are perſwaded; that tho all Nature and Reaſon are againſt it, yet 'tis a Divine Revelation, that there are three infinite (intellectual) *Subſtances*, three all-perfect *Spirits*, three all-ſufficient *Minds*: and that they may be ſaid to be but one God, on the Accounts beforegiven; and which I will now examine. He, and his Fathers ſay,

1. The ſecond and third Minds are originated from the firſt; the Son and Spirit have their Being, Life and Godhead from the Father: therefore they are one God with him. There never was a more abſurd thing ſaid by Men. They pretend to prove the Unity, or declare the Unity; by what is the firſt Cauſe of Diſtinction, Diverſity, and ſeparate Exiſtence. God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, are propagated, from God the Father; therefore they are *one* God with him: no Friends, no; therefore they are *ſeparate* Beings, and *diſtinct* Gods, from him; as diſtinct and ſeparate as Cauſe and Effect can be, which is the very *firſt* of Diſtinctions.

ſtinctions, and the *Ground and Reaſon* of all ſubſequent Diſtinction.

And what kind of God have theſe Gentlemen deviſed? A God who is, in one part of his Compoſition, in that part which they call *the Father*, unoriginated; but in his two other Parts, the Son and Spirit, not only originated *as to his Godhead*; but as *to his very Being and Life*. To ſay, as Dr. *Bull* and the Fathers do, that the Son and Spirit have their *Being*, *Life* and *Godhead* from the Father, or are originated in reſpect of all theſe from the Father; implies that they differ from the Father as *prior* and *poſterior*, former and latter: for the originated Spirits (or Parts of God) muſt of neceſſity be *poſterior* (latter or poſtnate) to that Spirit (or part of him) from which they are originated; the very term *Origination* is a Confeſſion of *a natural Poſteriority*, which cannot be in God. To grant to our Oppoſers that Diſtinction of theirs, *prior* in Nature and *prior* in Time; they cannot thereby ſecure their Cauſe: for if the Son and Spirit are originated, as to their Subſtance, Being, Life and Godhead, from the Father; they are *poſterior in Nature* to him, and therefore can neither be God, nor eſſential Parts of him. *Poſterior in Nature* (or poſtnate) is as incompatible to God, as *poſterior in Time*; for it implies an *Acceſſion* to him, and a *Change* in him. If there be ſomething in God, that is *poſterior in Nature*, to ſomething elſe in God; then the whole of God is not *connate*, there has been a Change and Acceſſion in him: which becauſe our Oppoſers dare not ſay, neither ought they to ſay the other; namely, that there is ſomewhat in God, that is *poſterior in Nature* to ſomewhat elſe in him; and yet to give up that, they know, is to give up their Cauſe.

But themſelves, that they may not ſeem ſtark Fools, take notice; that if to be originated from the Father, will make the Son and Spirit to be one God with the Father; the whole Creation, the very vileſt Parts of it, ſhall be one God with him, becauſe they are originated from him; that is, they give up this firſt Solution or Explication of the Unity; and they alledg, in the next Place, after this manner;

2. We do not affirm, that *bare* Origination from God, can make the Perſons ſo originated, to be one God with him: but only when they are *ſo* originated from God; as to have the ſame (ſpecifick) Subſtance and Properties that he hath; that is, when the originated Perſons have, like him, immortal, unchangable Subſtances; and are omniſcient, omnipotent, and the reſt that God is. As who ſhould ſay; we make it out, that *three* infinite Spirits are but *one* God, *by increaſing their firſt Diſtinction and Diverſity*. They were ſufficiently three Gods, by the Origination of the *ſecond* and *third*, from the *firſt*; but we will more aſcertain them to be ſo, by the Multiplication of Subſtances and ſpecifick Properties. I ask, what is it that conſti-

tutes

tutes or eſſentiates a God; is it not this, That we ſuppoſe a ſpiritual Subſtance, that is immortal and unchangable, and has the Divine Properties of Omniſcience and Omnipotence? If ſo, then by ſuppoſing more ſuch Subſtances, with ſuch Properties belonging to them; we do not ſuppoſe one God, but three. In ſhort, I ſay; they propoſe ſuch an Explication how *three* infinite Minds and Spirits are but *one* God, as all Men of Conſideration will take to be a Declaration and Aſſertion of three Gods: for they will have *three* infinite Minds to be *one* God, *becauſe they have three diſtinct Divine Subſtances, qualified each of them with (all) diſtinct Divine Properties*; when theſe Subſtances and Properties are the very Marks and Notifications of their diſtinct Divinities, or that they are diſtinct Gods.

But themſelves alſo acknowledg, that if Origination from the Father, and to be (ſpecifically) conſubſtantial with him, were ſufficient to make the Son and Spirit one God with the Father: then *James* and *John* being originated from their Father *Peter*, and conſubſtantial in all Reſpects with him, it will follow, that *Peter*, *James* and *John*, are not three Men, but one Man; or *Peter*, *James* and *John* are one Man with *Peter*. To get rid of this, they advance a third Bull, more ridiculous than either of the two former: it is this.

3. If the originated and conſubſtantial (and Divine) Perſons are propagated (from the firſt Perſon) *by an internal Production*; ſo that they are *always* and *inſeparably* in the Perſon that produced them; they are thereby moſt truly one God with him. Here the Reader needs only to conſider, that we are arguing concerning three ſuch Perſons as are confeſs'd (by theſe Oppoſers) to be *three* diſtinct Subſtances. Now to ſay of two of theſe Subſtances, that they are propagated *by an internal Production*, is a Bull; to add, that that they are *inſeparably* in the Perſon that produced them, is another: but 'tis worſt of all, to ſay; that by their Inexiſtence in the Father, the Son and Spirit are one God with him; this (I ſay) is a worſe Blunder, a more inexcuſable Overſight, than *internal Production*, or *inſeparable Subſtances*.

Internal Production, when ſaid of Subſtances, is a Contradiction, both in the *Senſe* and *Terms*: 'tis as much as to ſay, *a Production not produced*; a Generation not generated.

And a Subſtance being *that which can exiſt ſeparately*, or by it ſelf; and needeth not, as an Accident, to inexiſt in ſomething elſe: therefore an *inſeparable Subſtance* is a Subſtance without being a Subſtance, or *a Subſtance and no Subſtance*. Dr. *Bull* will anſwer, it may be, the Subſtances of the Son and Spirit are *always and inſeparably* in the Father; not from a natural Inhability to ſubſiſt (as they are Subſtances) by themſelves, or ſeparately: but only becauſe the Nature of the Divine Unity requires, that the ſecond and third Perſons of the Godhead, ſhould always

ways inexiſt in the firſt; and he in them. But if this be the Meaning of *inſeparably*; it is impertinently, as well as falſly added. Impertinently, becauſe the word *always* had been enough; and only proper to be here uſed. Falſly, becauſe things are not *inſeparable*, if only they are not *actually* ſeparated, but of their own Nature have an Hability to exiſt ſeparately. The Bull therefore remains, againſt whatſoever Excuſes: but were that which the Doctor aims to ſay never ſo true, we ſhall ſee preſently, it will not in the leaſt avail his Cauſe.

For, as I ſaid, the greateſt Blunder and Inobſervance of all, is what Dr. *Bull* (and the Fathers) take to be the Strength of this Hypotheſis; namely this; that the ſecond and third Perſons being *always in the firſt*, are therefore one God with him. For it is to be noted, that theſe Gentlemen hold, not only that the Son and Spirit are in the Father, but he alſo in them: it is *the mutual Inexiſtence* of all the three Perſons, and not only of the Son and Spirit in the Father, that maketh them to be one God. I ask hereupon, whether this mutual Inexiſtence, Immeation or Penetration of the three Perſons, be ſuch; that their Subſtances become *continuous*, as the Parts (for Inſtance) of the ſame Piece of Gold are; or only *contiguous*, like more Pieces of Gold that are heaped (or bagged) together? Are the Subſtances of the three Divine Perſons, I ſay, *continuous*; as (to uſe another Inſtance) the Parts of the ſame Angel or Soul are continuous and indiſcerpible? or are they *only contiguous*, as God or the Divine Subſtance (which pervades all things, Spirits as well as Bodies) is contiguous to the things which it pervades and immeates?

If Dr. *Bull* ſays, that the Divine Perſons, Minds and Spirits, or the three Divine Subſtances, have ſuch a mutual Inexiſtence, that they become continuous; as the (aſſignable conceivable) Parts of each Perſon's own Subſtance are, or as the Parts of an Angel or Soul are: He ſays *thereby*, and *therein*, that the Subſtances and Perſons are *identified*; which is Hereſy, becauſe (as the Athanaſian Creed ſpeaks) it confounds the Perſons. If the Subſtances are continuous, and thereby identified, the Properties alſo of the three Subſtances, in Mr. *Bull*'s Hypotheſis, will be identified too: for in this Hypotheſis there cannot be diſtinct Underſtandings, Wills and Energies, if the Subſtances are not diſtinct, but continuous, and (thereby) identified. But we need not to inſiſt on this; for Dr. *Bull* dares not ſay, that the Subſtances of the Divine Perſons are identified or continuous: he muſt ſay, and will ſay, that they do ſo inexiſt in one another, that *they are only contiguous*; there is only *a Contact* of their Subſtances, not an Identification or Continuity. But if there be only a Contact of the three Subſtances, they are as much three *Gods*, and *ſeparate Subſtances* in the Phyſical Senſe of the word *ſeparate*:

as three Men imbracing one another, are three distinct Men, not one Man; or as God and the Creation are separate Substances, tho he inexists in (pervates or immeates) the Works he hath made, and they again exist in him.

The Fathers that were Philosophers, when they said, the three Divine Persons or Substances are *in* one another, meant, *by their mutual Love and Agreement:* but those Fathers that were not learned, or understood only the Platonick Philosophy, which is wholly moral and metaphysical, and never meddles with *the natural Reasons of things*; I say, the Fathers that were not *natural Philosophers* imagined such an Inexistence of the three Persons, that the said Persons *were physically and substantially in one another*, and thereby (say they) one God. They knew not, that a *substantial Inexistence* must either be *by the Continuity of the Substances*; which confounds the Substances or Persons: or only by Contiguity or *Contact*, which can no more make three Divine Persons and Spirits to be one God, than three Men sitting close on the same Bench, are thereby one Man; or than God, who is in all Spirits (whether Angels or Souls) and they in him, are the same Being or the same Substance, not separate Substances.

In short, Dr. *Bull* and these Fathers say; the three Divine Persons are three distinct several Substances, and do substantially immeate (or inexist in) one another: yet so, that they are not continuous or identified, as the Parts of the same (numerical) Substance are, but only contiguous. *We* say hereupon, that this will never make them to be one God, because *mere Contact is only a juxta-Position, not a real Union.* All Philosophers, but only the Platonists who understand not Physicks, or *the Nature of things*, will assent to this Reasoning: and I doubt not, it was one of the Causes, why the Schoolmen (who were learned Philosophers) unanimously agreed, that three distinct (Divine) Substances are most certainly three Gods; and they (the Divines of the Schools) have been followed by all the Divinity-Chairs in *Christendom*, from about the Year 1200 to this present time. I do not believe, there is a Chair in *Christendom* that will own more than one Divine Substance; or will admit that *three* Divine Substances can be *one* God: Dr. *Bull* will not approve his Hypothesis to the Chairs, or to Universities or Schools of Learning. I am of opinion however, that so arrogant a Man as Dr. *Bull* will not let go his Hypothesis; it being too the Doctrine of the Fathers, and of a great many learned Men who treat of these Questions as Divines, not as Philosophers: and Dr. *Bull* having acquired so great a Reputation all over *Europe*, by his Book; the Chairs and Nominal Trinitarians will not, it may be, adventure to attack him.

But

But if after all, Dr. *Bull*, fearing the Numbers and Reputation of the Nominal Trinitarians, will deny his Hypotheſis; and (in hopes to compound with them) pretend that it differs not (or not *materially*) from the Doctrine of the Schools: beſides that all diſcerning and ingenuous Men will laugh at his Puſillanimity; I ſhall not deſire an eaſier Task, than to prove from his own Book, and from innumerable Quotations of the Fathers, that both they and he hold three diſtinct Divine Subſtances, and conſequently ſo many Minds and Spirits, both which are rejected as Heretical (nay as Tritheiſtical) by the Schools and their Followers.

I will conclude this firſt *Part* of my Anſwer, with obſerving, that tho Dr. *Bull* ſays here, that the Fathers believed the three (Divine) Perſons are one God, becauſe *the ſecond and third are derived from the firſt, have like Subſtances and Properties with him, and all of them do mutually immeate one another:* yet this is not the Explication of any *particular* Father, much leſs of *all* of them; but an Hypotheſis that Dr. *Bull* has pieced up, from the Writings of *divers* Fathers. The Fathers explained the Unity in Trinity, each of them his own way. One ſaid, the three Perſons are one God, becauſe *they are in one another, by mutual Love and Agreement.* Another ſaid, they are one God, becauſe of *the Subordination and perfect Subjection of the ſecond and third Perſons, to him who is the firſt God.* Another, they are one God, becauſe *the Son and Spirit are propagated from the Father.* Another, becauſe they unanimouſly govern the World; that is, they are one God, *becauſe they are one Monarchy, and thereby (as it were) one Ruler.* Some of them ſaid, three Divine Perſons, and three infinite Spirits are *God* and the *Godhead*; in ſuch Senſe *as all Men are called Man or Mankind.* As three golden Coins of the ſame Emperor are called *Aurum*, Gold, not *Aura*, Golds, in the Plural: So in proper ſpeaking, three Divine Perſons, becauſe (like three Men, or three golden Coins) they are conſubſtantial; that is, have the ſame ſpecifick Subſtances and Properties; they are (in proper ſpeaking) to be called *God*, not *Gods*. This was a very ridiculous Reaſoning, contrary both to Grammar and Philoſophy; and yet it was the Explication of ſome of the moſt learned of the Poſt-Nicene Fathers.

Briefly, theſe two things I affirm: That Dr. *Bull*'s Explication of the Unity of God, is indeed taken out of ſome of the Fathers: but it was not (as 'tis laid down by him) the particular Explication given by any one of them, much leſs the agreed and common Explication of all of them; but part of it is from ſome, other Parts of it from other Fathers. Secondly, the Fathers advanced ſeveral other Explications; on which ſome of them inſiſted, more and rather, than on any part of Mr. *Bull*'s. The Ante-Nicens chiefly urged the Unity *of Love*, or elſe *of Monarchy:*

the moſt learned (but leaſt judicious) of the Poſt-Nicens ſerved themſelves of the (pretended) Conſubſtantiality, or that the three Perſons having like Subſtances and Properties, are therefore one God; as all Men or *Mankind* are called *Homo*, and as three (or more) golden Coins are called *Aurum*, Gold; never *Aura*, Golds. But of theſe things I ſhall ſpeak fully, in the Concluſion of the third Part of this Anſwer to Dr. *Bull*.

The CONCLUSION.

I Have ſaid what I intended in this firſt Part. In the Second I will report the Doctrine of the following Fathers, concerning the Trinity and the Perſon of our bleſſed Saviour, in their own Words: By the following Fathers I mean thoſe Fathers who flouriſhed from about the Year 150, to the Nicene Council, or the Year 325. In the laſt Part I ſhall diſcover Dr. *Bull*'s Frauds and Miſtakes, detect his Sophiſtries and Eluſions; and confront his Miſrepreſentation of the Fathers, with the Confeſſions and Judgment of the Criticks, who have either publiſhed or commented on the Writings of the Fathers. Here and now it remains only, that I inform the Reader, who hath not ſeen Dr. *Bull*'s Books, why I have anſwer'd ſo indifferently, and without any particular Deference to the Merit of his Learning and Abilities: for it cannot be denied, that this Gentleman is a dextrous Sophiſter; or that he has read the principal Fathers with a more than ordinary Application, Diligence and Obſervation. Dr. *Bull* has written two Books, his *Defence of the Nicene Faith*, and *Judgment of the Catholick Church*, deſignedly and directly againſt the Unitarians; whether they be Arians or Socinians. In the firſt of theſe he attacks more particularly *Chr. Sandius*, a very learned Arian; and the Author of *Irenicum Irenicorum*, who was Dr. *Zwicker* M. D. a Socinian. Dr. *Zwicker* is complemented by Dr. *Bull*, with ſuch Flowers as theſe; *Bipedum ineptiſſimus*, the greateſt Fop in Nature: *Omnium odio, qui veritatem & candorem amant, dignus*; deſerving the Hatred of all Lovers of Truth and Sincerity. Of *Sandius* he ſaith, *He hath ſhip-wrack'd his Conſcience, as well as his Faith; a Trifler, a mere (empty) Pretender*: He adds at *p.* 331. *He hath only tranſcribed the Author of* Iren. Irenicorum; and in one Place, he prays for *Sandius* as one that is mad. This, and

and such as this, is Dr. *Bull*'s constant Language concerning these two very learned Men: nor doth he ever reply to them, without pretending an absolute and incontestable Victory; and casting some most unworthy Scorn or other upon them, by occasion of his supposed Advantage. He *never* calls the Arians by any other Name but *Arianitæ*, *the mad Arians*; and Socinianism is *always* with him *the Atheistical Heresy*, I do not remember that he ever calls our Doctrine by a better Name. In short, he hath expressed such a Malevolence; and hath so notoriously and infamously broke *the Cartel* of Honour and Civility, that was thought to be agreed and establish'd between Persons of excellent Learning, or great Abilities, when they happen to be ingaged in contrary Sides; that no Respect or Tenderness can be shown to him by any Unitarian. His Barbarities and Immanities towards a Person so little deserving such Usage, and so much above Mr. *Bull* in all Regards, as *Sandius* was; and his Arrogance towards, and (hare-brain'd) Contempt of all Unitarians, whether antient or modern: I say, his Temerity and Extravagance in this kind, is so excessive, or rather is so outrageous, that he hath left to himself no manner of Right or Claim to the very least Degree of Humanity or good Manners towards him.

And see here what Judgment he makes, of the late Socinian Treatises, that have been published within six or seven Years last past; in his Preface to *the Judgment of the Catholick Church*: "Divers *impious Wretches*, "within these few Years, have attacked the principal Article of the "Faith; namely, the Divinity of "our Saviour: Some of them are "Arians, others Samosatenians or "Socinians; I may say of both, as "the great *H. Zanchius* somewhere "does of *L. Socinus*, *Fr. Davidis*, "*Blandrata*, and other Founders "of the Socinian Heresy in the last "Age. *I do not read, without Disdain, the silly and mad Defences "of the new Arians and Photinians: for I cannot meet in their "Writings with the very least Degree of Wit, or good Sense; they "have nothing but the Repetition of "old exploded Follies, or new Weaknesses of their own.* But lest they "should think that they have gained the Victory; or should mislead the Weak, some pious and "learned Men have deserved the "publick Praise and Thanks, by opposing themselves to the Sophistries of these Triflers. It is in this strain that Dr. *Bull* has treated us, every where; in every Page of his two Books: therefore it could not be reasonably expected, that in answering, we should fall prostrate to such an inveterate and supercilious Malevolence and Arrogance; or make court to such a *Hildebrand* as this Man (even) affects to show himself.

I know not, whether he will perswade many, that *a Diabolical Spirit* is a fit Guide to be chose, in the Search

Search of ſacred Truths: or that thoſe have the true *Faith*, who have not the leaſt Grain of *Charity?* If Mr. *Bull* had railed ſo bitterly, only at the preſent Engliſh Socinians, and their Writers, we might have imputed his Intemperance to his Fear, or to his Ambition. We might apprehend, that he begins to doubt, that this (growing) Sect may, one day, turn him out of his Parſonage, or his Prebend: or that by Zeal and Bigotry he intended to recommend himſelf to his Superiours in the Church, and merit a Biſhoprick or Deanery. But why has he inſulted the Dead; nay look'd back 1200, and 1400 Years, ſcattering his Gall and Venom into the Urns of Confeſſors and Martyrs, of the ſecond and third Ages of Chriſtianity? Even thoſe whom *Diocleſian* and *Julian* the Apoſtate, not only ſpared, but honoured and rewarded for their Sanctity and Learning; Dr. *Bull* has broke up their Monuments, and ſcatter'd their Aſhes.

His Metropolitan not only preached it, to the moſt conſiderable Auditory of *England*; but publiſhed it too, from the Preſs, to all the World: "That the Socinians argue "Matters, with Temper and Gra"vity; that they reaſon *cloſely*, and "*clearly*, with extraordinary Guard "and Caution, with as much Dex"terity and Decency. The ableſt "Managers, ſaith he, that ever yet "meddled with Controverſy; in "compariſon of whom the Jeſuit is "a Scold and a Bungler. Archbiſh. 2d Serm. on the Divin. of our Saviour. p. 71. But Mr. *Bull*, becauſe he has more Wit and Judgment than three Archbiſhops, anſwers immediately from the *Oxford*-Preſs; that his *Grace* is either mad, or dotes; that ſince he (Dr. *Bull*) has wrote againſt the Socinians, 'tis impoſſible they ſhould have the leaſt Temper, Dexterity, good Senſe, or ought elſe, that may recommend them to Eſteem. The Man grows warm; let us part for the preſent, leſt we alſo grow as fooliſh as he.

Aug. 19.
1695.

FINIS.